THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII MARCH, 1939 No. 225

EDITORIAL

IT is now more than a year since the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine[1] was published. We are informed that about 33,000 copies of it have been sold. This fact by itself indicates that there is a widespread demand for what the Report was expected to supply. There is evidence to show that it was more eagerly bought and read in circles where theological books normally arouse little interest than in clerical or ecclesiastical circles. It is, however, easier to gauge the effect that the Report has had on the latter than on the former. What did the men and women, who rarely read and still more rarely buy books about Christian doctrine, expect to find when they bought this book? These are general questions, and they can be answered only in a general way. What was hoped for, we believe, was a clear and authoritative statement of Christian belief—authoritative in the sense that it was the work of contemporary experts as well qualified as could be found for the purpose, not authoritative in the sense that there was affixed to it an ecclesiastical *imprimatur*. This latter, we fear, at present carries little weight, and it will carry weight again only when the intrinsic authority of the Christian faith, and therefore of the Church which is responsible for its declaration, has been freshly vindicated.

* * * * *

Many who hoped to find in the Report a clear and authoritative statement of Christian belief will have been disappointed, not because it is in no wise to be found there, but because the form in which it is presented is calculated to puzzle anyone who is not in a position to understand and allow for the circumstances in which the Commission was appointed and the methods of procedure which were more or less prescribed by the terms of its appointment. The Commission was not appointed simply in order to

[1] *Doctrine in the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 4s. and 2s. 6d.).

produce as true and clear and definite a statement of Christian belief as its members could compass. We can see now that the result would probably have been far more satisfactory if their terms of reference had been as simple and straightforward as that. The terms of reference were actually as follows: " To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences." In other words, the appointment of the Commission was prompted by the hope that it would contribute to a better understanding between the parties in the Church of England, rather than by the hope that it would be able directly to lay before people, without as well as within the Church, a positive and reasoned exposition of the Christian faith in an idiom that made contact with the minds of men of contemporary education.

* * * * *

We are not saying that the members of the Commission allowed these limiting ecclesiastical considerations unduly to influence their deliberations. They are, in fact, to be congratulated on the way in which they sat loosely to their terms of reference. It is evident from what the chairman says in his introduction to the Report, and indeed from the character of the Report itself, that the members of the Commission realized that the attempt to demonstrate agreement and to remove disagreement within the Church of England ought to have been quite a subsidiary and indirect part of the task allotted to them. Nevertheless, they could not altogether disregard their terms of reference, and it appears that these did in fact determine the form and proportion of their Report. Twelve pages of the Report are given to " Prolegomena: the sources and authority of Christian doctrine," fifty-nine pages to " The doctrine of God and of Redemption," and over a hundred pages to " The Church and Sacraments." This proportion, which reflects the chief controversial interests in the Church of England during the decade 1920-30, must astonish any reader who now takes up the Report without a knowledge of the circumstances of its origin. While the original promoters of the Commission may have intended to get below those interests and to fix attention on " the grounds

of belief,"[1] in the event they only partly succeeded in doing so. It is generally acknowledged that the latter part of the Report is much more thorough and convincing than the earlier. The discussion of the foundations of belief is "scrappy" by comparison with the superstructure that is erected upon them. We imagine that the members of the Commission would not only acknowledge but emphasize that this is so, and would explain that the proportions of their Report are due not to their own estimate of the relative importance of the subject matter of its various parts, but to the nature of the particular undertaking that was committed to them. The chairman in his introduction in effect says this.

* * * * *

While for this reason the earlier parts of the Report are liable to disappoint the ordinary reader, they are far from being worthless. They do in fact contain so much that is good that they intensify the wish that the Commission might have been able to make them as proportionately thorough as the rest. If the members had had time and opportunity to explore together the ultimate grounds of belief as thoroughly as they must have explored the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments, they would surely have made an even more notable contribution to the development of Christian theology. What from our point of view is not less important, they would have produced a Report which would have gone further to meet the needs of men and women outside the Church, who are willing and often desperately anxious to consider afresh the claims of the Christian faith, but who have sufficient sense to see what are the issues of first importance. As it is—and we do not see how in the circumstances this could have been avoided—the Report affords much less help to men and women in this position than it does to those who are already professing Christians, but who are mystified by varieties of teaching about what are less than first principles.

* * * * *

It is gravely to underestimate the value of the Report to say that it is a generation out of date. It is an epitome of the best theological work that has been done in England during the post-war period, and it has demonstrated that there is a better way of dealing with doctrinal differences than the old methods of party polemics and agitations, of

[1] See G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*[2], p. 1145.

which unfortunately there has been some recrudescence since its publication. But it is also true that the theological climate now is appreciably different from what it was when the Commission was appointed. The chairman points this out in his introduction. If the Commission were appointed now, he says, "its perspectives would be different." The theological problems with which we are being called upon to deal to-day are more fundamental than those which figured most prominently in ecclesiastical controversy a generation ago, and it is already apparent that the accepted party-cleavages among Anglicans, and also the accepted divisions among Christians, are becoming obsolete. The point which Father Tribe makes in his article in this number with regard to the theology of the Christian social movement could be illustrated from almost any other aspect of contemporary theology. In this connexion the best use that can be made of the Doctrinal Report is to treat it not as finally establishing a new norm of orthodoxy, but as securing the principle that the only agreement worth having is that of men who possess the right to differ and as preparing the way for the investigation of further and more fundamental problems.

* * * * *

It follows from what has been said that we do not intend that THEOLOGY shall be committed either to the defence of the Report or to its dismissal. We shall try constantly to bear in mind the needs of those who are looking for further light on the grounds of Christian belief and on the meaning of Christian doctrine, and whose appetite is likely to have been whetted as much as satisfied by the Report. We shall also be willing to publish articles that examine questions which are thought to have been ambiguously or unsatisfactorily dealt with in the Report. Now that the spate of alarmist denunciations and crude misunderstandings which followed its publication may be expected to have spent its force, it is reasonable to hope that more carefully considered criticisms and appraisals of it may be forthcoming. Two documents of this kind have in fact recently been published which will deserve to be read alongside the Report itself. One of these is a Memorandum by the Rev. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.[1] The other is a statement,

[1] Published with the authority of the Council of the Church Union (S.P.C.K., 1s.). We hope shortly to publish a review of this Memorandum by a member of the Doctrinal Commission.

signed by several well-known high churchmen, in defence of the "Liberal Catholic" tradition.[1] The latter does not actually refer to the Doctrinal Report, but, unless we are mistaken, its publication has been occasioned by the violently hostile reception accorded to the Report by several high church organizations. Those who read Father Hebert's Memorandum in the expectation that he will be found to endorse that style of reception will, if they are discerning, be disposed to discover in him a certain resemblance to Balaam. At the same time, his Memorandum contains the kind of considered criticism of the Report that we hope will be forthcoming from other theologians as well, without reference to their party allegiance. The first outburst of criticism proceeded from churchmen who have not yet reached the point at which the Commission began; what is needed now is criticism from those who are ready to move on from where the Commission left off.

* * * * *

If we may venture upon a word of regret which applies to both these documents, it is that they would have been more effective if, without regard to the interests of an ecclesiastical party, they could have been conceived in a more boldly outward-looking and forward-looking context—*i.e.*, if their authors had felt themselves free to address a wider and, perhaps we may add, a younger audience. But no doubt this is to ask, as in the case of the Report itself, that their terms of reference might have been different. With regard to what Father Hebert aptly calls "theological notions," while we shall not hesitate to speak definitely when occasion requires, we shall aim at keeping THEOLOGY as an open forum. "The Church," said F. D. Maurice, "is a body united in the acknowledgment of a living *Person*; every sect is a body united in the acknowledgment of a certain *Notion*."

[1] Published in the *Church Times* and *The Guardian* (January 20, 1939).

Biblical Theology

In a previous article in this series, theology was defined as " nothing more or less than talking about God." In a very real sense this definition holds good of Biblical theology. The Scriptures may be described, somewhat broadly, perhaps, but quite properly, as human speech about God: the " talking " of certain men, whether known or unknown to us by name, whether authors or " redactors," who gave the documents comprised in the Bible that form in which—except for irremediable textual corruptions—they now lie before us. It accordingly follows that, if one assumption be made, namely that in a world very much like our own reasonable men are likely to have said what they wanted to say more or less to their own satisfaction, these documents are first-hand evidence for the motive, meaning and purpose of those who wrote them. Biblical criticism is simply the concentration of all the resources of literary, historical and linguistic science upon these documents in the hope that, ridding ourselves of all pre-conceptions, and making full use of all the relevant means at our disposal, we may succeed in understanding exactly what was being said.

This is a vast activity, but it does not need to be pursued very far in order to discover that the " talking " of all these men has one common characteristic. From the beginning to the end of the Bible we find ourselves confronted with writers who believe themselves to have apprehended something about God—His will, His providence, His purpose—in *history*. It is the course of events—the short-lived successes and long humiliation of Israel, the triumphant progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome; or the pattern of created life—the rhythm of seed-time and harvest, the universal experiences of slavery and freedom, peace and war; or the thread of an individual life—the sufferings of Jeremiah, the ministry and death of Jesus of Nazareth, the ominous end of an arrogant tyrant: that sets them talking. The prophet who declares the ultimate issues of a particular moment of national crisis, the psalmist who pleads for deliverance from the oppression of mighty men and the plague of his own soul, the historian who re-casts the history of former times in the light of events in which he himself has been involved, or the apostle who makes a

text of the everyday life of Corinth, are alike in believing that they have seen part of the observable structure or flux of the universe in relation to God and in feeling compelled to make this relationship known to others. Throughout the Bible it is the interpretation of history in the broadest and in the narrowest sense that impels human speech about God.

But their speech about God is also controlled by the fact that these writers have all in some degree inherited or received from others an already existing tradition of events seen in relationship to God: a tradition which they bring to bear with reflection and reason upon the problems pressed upon them in their own lives. This is most clearly exemplified in the case of quite conscious " theologians " like the authors of Job and Deuteronomy, Jesus ben Sirach, St Paul, or the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews. And it is everywhere discernible, even though it is often unconscious, in such editorial activities, for instance, as the re-shaping of the writings of most of the prophets and the constant setting and re-setting of the words and deeds of Jesus in order that their implications may be more patent to those who are struggling to obey His word in the baffling and perplexing birth-pangs of Gentile Christianity. Nowhere in the Bible do men talk about God *e vacuo*. Their words are controlled by history interpreted by the light of memory and reason.

Two considerations follow from this preliminary survey. First, in order to do justice to the Bible itself Biblical study must proceed, with the most rigorous scientific discipline, to find out precisely what the Biblical writers meant when they wrote what they did. Secondly, this is a primary function of those who accept the Bible as the revelation of God, because, unless the Biblical use of the Biblical material is to be ignored, the Bible itself cries out to be heard accurately in order that it may not be left talking about God in Hebrew and Greek, but may play an active part in resolving the problems which history—the Bible would say God-given history—thrusts upon Christians to-day. The modern Biblical theologian may therefore conceive his functions as twofold: to investigate the Biblical material scientifically and objectively; and to extract from it dogmas and principles for the guidance of those who accept its authority.

So far so good. But the beauty of this definition of Biblical theology—and its radical weakness—is just this:

that the modern Biblical theologian is thereby permitted —even if he likes to devote his results personally to the service of " Revealed Religion "—to remain, as a theologian, entirely detached from them. And the possibility of such detachment the Bible, from beginning to end, excludes. God remains unknown, an idol made by man, unless man, in beginning to know Him, discovers himself in relation to Him, known already by Him. Far from being able, like the Greek, to discuss and consider God merely as an object of speculation and observation, the Hebrew or the Christian is set talking about God by a history that informs him that God is speaking *to* and *about* him. God is revealing to him, not some nice metaphysical detail of His own nature, but His command, His judgment, His promise. And the man who hears no longer questions. Job abhors himself in dust and ashes. The Christians are compelled, either to *do* the truth that has been declared to them in the flesh of Jesus, or to give God the lie and thus show that they have no knowledge of God at all.

Moreover, the Bible excludes the possibility of codifying the knowledge of God as principles and dogmas to which problems may be dispassionately referred. This is the solemn warning of the Lawyers, the Judaizers, the Corinthian modernists. For when the true issue of any problem is seen—that is to say, when any event or experience of man is seen so clearly that it demands to be related to God—God is revealed as alone able to answer the problem. This again is the lesson of Job. It is reiterated with universal and ultimate authority for Christians in the acute and all-embracing problem of the Cross.

It would seem, then, that although we have rightly defined the Biblical writers as men who talk about God, they themselves envisage their activity—however consciously they may be " theologians "—not as talking about God, but as setting down God's speech. And however diligently they build up the edifice of the Law or legislate for the behaviour of men and women in church, they are everywhere conscious that problems of faith and practice are ultimately solved, not by reference to principles and dogmas, though these be resolutely based upon the supposed revelation of God in history and tradition, but only by the living God Himself.

This perception, that all creation depends upon God and presents, apart from Him, an unresolved problem, con-

ditions the Biblical outlook upon the whole of life. No doubt at times the perspective is foreshortened, and pious men identify with the judgment and promise of God the good things which life, materially and observably, lacks. But this is superficial. The man who understands the Scriptures knows that the palpable lack and need of man's earthly existence is pointing, through the immediate spectacle of creaturely dependence, to that ultimate dependence upon God which truly defines man. Scarcity and want, for instance, speak of God who gives and withholds those material things by which human life is continued and without which men die. But these things are, even as they are given and withheld, shown to be in themselves ultimately inadequate. The Israelites who yearn for the flesh-pots of Egypt are sinful because they fail to see that "God with them" is the answer to all their need. The food that God gives visibly on earth satiates, but can never satisfy. "Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." Similarly the dependence of the nation upon God speaks, not of an earthly kingdom whose destruction would end the sovereignty of God, but of a Kingdom that is a reality even when Israel is led captive to Babylon.

The essential distinction between the Old Testament and New Testament views of life lies, not in the analysis of life as urgently dependent upon God, but in the hope of God's ultimate salvation. Both see "history"—life as experienced by men—as crying out for its "end": the final consummation and perfection that every part of history demonstrably needs and that God alone can supply. But although no doubt many Old Testament writers see that this "end" of history must cut right across the chronological sequence of time and the observable spatial universe, they all, as they become aware of the need of God's intervention, tend to regard it as a future event. His Word is indeed to be heard now in history; but when it is finally uttered, that which it declares will inevitably be also performed, and His judgment and mercy will be no longer objects of faith, but revealed fact. That this is no mere projection of selfish desires is shown by the readiness of prophetically informed Israel to recognize the day of the Lord as darkness as well as light, and by the awareness of the devout Jew of the tension between his own sinfulness and the blazing holiness of God upon which his unworthiness

can have no claim. It is, indeed, the nature of the God revealed through history that conditions His ultimate intervention. To a Jeremiah the day of the Lord must mean the terrible judgment of Israel as Jeremiah sees it; yet, because God is God, His day remains an object of lively hope. Nor is God's future intervention regarded as a wholly other-worldly era of blessings completely unrelated to the present moment. Just as the present speaks of the ultimate need of God, so will the final revelation of God judge, purge and consummate the present.

In direct contrast with this conception of the speech of God to men through the pattern of the universe, through the thread of individual lives, through His particular dealings with His chosen people, a speech that continually raises final problems which only the future revelation of God can resolve, and which therefore hangs upon the day of the Lord, stands the New Testament recognition of the Word of God in Jesus. Here too the problems that are to be seen everywhere in life are resolved only by the Word of God which is His final revelation. Indeed, these problems are now seen in their full significance, for, whereas the Old Testament believer could partially resolve the problem by supposing his own sin to be postponing the salvation of God, the New Testament believer sees the problem poised supremely and absolutely in the suffering and death of the sinless Christ. But now the final Word of God is no longer withheld in the future, but has invaded the past and the present. The answer of God, the salvation and redemption that alone make sense of His world, has been manifest in the raising of Jesus of Nazareth from the dead. Indeed, God's Word now belongs to the past: it has been spoken once and for all, and all that His speech to men, through creation, through the pattern of life, promises, is asserted as the truth at that point where it seemed absolutely excluded by the present fact—namely, in the utter dereliction and destitution of the one Man whose life was pleasing in His sight. But although God's Word belongs to the past, it is never allowed to drop away into the past. The locus of the Christian life is still the point where the merciful Word of God has met men in the resurrection of Jesus, and the Christian hope is that the present moment is, in the eternal moment of the death and resurrection of Jesus, met by the mercy of God. For this is the end of all history. There still remains a tension, but it is no longer,

as in the Old Testament, the tension experienced by men aware of their own sin and of the gulf that separates them from God, but the tension between the " flesh " in which the old, corruptible world, uncrowned and unconsummated by the mercy of God, still seems to have sway, and the world of faith in which God has already embraced man with His promises. There is still a future hope, but it is no longer the hope of the future action of God, but the certainty of the future revelation to man's sight of that glory by which, according to the Word of God in Jesus, he is already encompassed.

The Gospel of God—His Word declaring salvation, His effectual Word making salvation a fact—is therefore the subject of all Christian speech, and cannot be represented as a directly and finally self-explanatory statement or set of principles about God. The temptation to represent it thus very soon appeared in the early Church. On the one hand, because the Word of God was recognized as spoken once and for all in Jesus, it was tempting to luxuriate in the mercy of God. " Shall we sin that grace may abound ?" Since God's mercy has been declared, is this not now a dogma about God, lying behind us in the past, that enables us to rest secure in faith in God's forgiveness of our sins, without any direct reference to Him of our present use of the present moment ? " God forbid," says St Paul. This is not the character of that life and death in which the faith of Jesus has been met by the mercy of God. The consistent *human* intention of that life and death was the dethronement of the *ego* in complete dependence upon God. God's mercy meets man's need at the point where that need is completely recognized and offered to God. The life and death of Jesus are His complete obedience to the will of God, and unless the Christian life is controlled by the same will and offered with the same obedience the meaning of the flesh of Jesus is ignored and the Word of God declared in Jesus spells judgment and not mercy. " Have this mind in you." St Paul can never count himself to have moved beyond the precarious, terribly narrow way traced out by the humiliation of Jesus. That is why he clutches at, and glories in, the spectacle of his own " weakness " and confronts the " reigning " Corinthians with apostolic humiliation and foolishness. His sufficiency is of God, but this means that he must strive to hang as completely upon the will of God, looking to His mercy, as

did Jesus in the utter theocentricity of His obedience. Between Paul and God there is no dogma upon which he can rest, but only the body of Jesus, in which all in him that wishes to luxuriate or stand upon dogma has to be crucified since he is raised up with Jesus only by the mercy of God.

On the other hand, because Jesus has given men a visible example, the danger arises of trying to codify a Christian way of life in the new order that is the Church. Once more men are tempted to frame and rest upon principles. This is equally obnoxious to St Paul, since it appears to resurrect just that concept of a law giving life which Jesus nailed to the cross. The Church is not a new society created to do just that which caused Israel to stumble. The mercy of God, the sufficiency that alone makes human action acceptable and sinful men saints, has been bestowed while " we were yet sinners." To conceive the Christian life as a set of principles by which we may attain to God is to slip back under the condemnation of the law, to ignore the saving fact that we have already been made to sit down in heavenly places, and to substitute for joy in the promises of God another tortuous and deceptive way of human achievement leading directly back into the old tension between sin and salvation and restoring the domination of death and judgment. Man has once more tried to exalt his own commentary upon the Word of God into the place of the final Word of God, and, finding himself confronted with his own words, is thrown, not upon the mercy of God Himself, which should be his only hope, but upon his own fallible devices.

But what of the words of Jesus Himself? The Fourth Gospel warns us that they too may be misunderstood if they are erected into something self-explanatory and absolute between man and God. The Jews stumble because they listen to the words of Jesus but do not hear the Word in His words. The predominating motive of the Fourth Gospel in defining Jesus in relation to the Father is to lead men back, not simply *to* the Jesus of history, but *through* the Jesus of history to the Father. This is why every Johannine statement about the centrality and crucial importance of the flesh of Jesus is qualified and restated. The Word became flesh—but it is the Spirit that quickeneth. He that has seen Jesus has seen the Father, yet no man has seen God at any time. " My Father worketh until now, and I

work." "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing." The glory which the Christians perceive in Jesus is not an observable human glory, but the glory of God, completely manifest in the hour of humiliation when He seems to be altogether inglorious. And as it is with Jesus, so it is with those who continue His work. Men call them apostles—but the Fourth Gospel introduces this word only to disparage it as having in itself no final significance. The apostle is not greater than He who sent him. Elsewhere the noun is not mentioned, and Jesus is seen *sending out* His disciples just as *He Himself has been sent*. In themselves they are not great fountains of wisdom upon whose authorized judgments their hearers may rest securely. Their mission, properly delivered and understood, forces men back upon Jesus Himself. But Jesus Himself is no final resting place. He is to be preached only because His life and death are themselves a mission. He is in effect the Apostle sent from God, and His words are valid and life-giving only because they confront men with the eternal, solely and wholly sufficient Word of God Himself.

Neither St Paul nor the author of the Fourth Gospel construes his writing as "talking about God." To both, what they have to say is momentous because it exposes, not themselves only, but their hearers also, to the possibilities of accepting or rejecting the Word of God, and so of being accepted or rejected. As the Gospel to which they themselves have submitted is uttered through them, men stand, in the last hour, under the judgment of God Himself. Yet although the authority of the apostolic word is founded upon the belief that it is the Word of God and not of man, these writers are concerned to show that it does not simply emerge from the past, but confronts men in the particular situation and issues in which they are involved in the present. St Paul thrusts the Corinthians or the Galatians back upon the death of Jesus as immediately relevant to the situations in those two churches: the author of the First Epistle of St John shows how the schism among those whom he is addressing springs directly from the fact that they have moved away from the confession of Jesus in the flesh. The actual problems which confront these later generations of Christians should make them apprehend that the final solution has already been uttered in the life and death and resurrection of the Son of God: when this

is perceived, the old commandment is seen to be eternally new.

If this is true of the Pauline and Johannine writings, it is equally true of the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. The Gospel of God is urgent, final and all-embracing. In the apostolic speeches in Acts, the fulfilment of the promises of God in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus is declared, and men are made aware that they stand under the Word of God that bids them repent and believe and be saved: the Synoptic Gospels enforce the same urgent proclamation and exhortation by means of the reported words and works of Jesus Himself.

It would seem, then, that in the Bible, and above all in the New Testament, men are not consciously " talking about God," but are striving to submit themselves so completely to the Word of God which they have themselves heard in history that God's word may not find them wanting, but speak to others through their own lives and speech. If the Biblical writers were asked to define " theology " there is little doubt that they would do so as " The Word, the Talking, of God."

But what is the modern theologian to say? Is this attitude to the Bible not tantamount to denying the possibility of theology altogether? If he says this, does he not deserve to be dismissed—as he certainly will be—as a " Barthian " or " fundamentalist " trying to take refuge in the Divine Authority of the Written Word in an age when all human sanctions and human authority—and human reason—seem to be tottering and discredited?

First of all let it be said that it is not really the break-down of " humanism " apparent in the post-War period, but the logic of objective Biblical criticism that has led to an almost universal return to the Bible as " theology." Secondly, the fact that the theologian is compelled by criticism to show that the Biblical writers envisaged their function as springing entirely from the self-revelation of God does not authorize an hysterical insistence upon the importance of what they are saying. The student of the Bible must, it is true, warn those whom he addresses that they are misusing the Bible if they treat it merely as a chapter in a more or less universal activity of human speculation and speech about God. Both Old and New Testaments stubbornly reject such treatment, for they affirm that the

" revelation " by which they are controlled is unique. The student of the Bible must also warn readers that they will make as little sense of the Bible if they handle it thus as a mathematician would make of the music of Bach if he handled it as mathematics. But this warning applies equally to those who are in a strict sense " fundamentalists," who, in exalting the speech of Jesus or of the Biblical writers into the literal expression of the Word of God, remove themselves just as completely from the Apostolic and Biblical dependence upon the living God as do those who try to understand the Bible as comparative religion. Yet, if the student of the Bible has read his documents aright, he must see that the authorizing of the Biblical message that culminates in the Gospel is the affair, not of some human formula or proof, but of God Himself. It is of no authoritative consequence, even, that a large number of Christians through the ages may seem to have shown a consistent testimony to the revelation of God in history. They may have been consistently deceived—there are other equally impressive examples of many men thinking alike. The student of the Bible will therefore abandon any attempt to truss up the revelation of God upon some observable human authority, and will do so the more readily since he has perceived that this is precisely, in one form or another, the misunderstanding that caused Israel to erect the law ordained to death into a means of life, and that again and again vitiated and obscured the theocentric Gospel in the early Church. Ultimately the Word is God's alone—He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. But woe betide the modern theologian who thinks that he has heard, and who does not, in apostolic humility and submission (not in crushing paradoxes !), *do the truth* by attempting to draw the eyes of others to the sole place of understanding revealed to him, and to point to it as the Word of God !

Nevertheless, at least two considerations present themselves that are not without general relevance for men and women living in the world. First, the Bible clearly differs in one respect from all other " talking about God." It tells of the speech of God *in history*, in the course of events, in individual experience; whereas all other human speech about God tried to find God outside the ordinary run of human history, either by sheer philosophical argument or in some particular human experience that is recognizably

distinct from all other human experience—ecstasy or mysticism. Seeing that men and women do in fact learn as they go through life, neither from unadulterated processes of dialectic nor yet from non-historical experiences, but in the flux of events (how do you learn to grow in love and knowledge of a friend, or even of an art?), this consideration does certainly commend the Bible as just such a setting forth of Himself as might be expected of a God who has made men and women to be creatures experiencing history.

Secondly, the Bible, having exerted a most realistic criticism upon human life and revealed it as a poor, insufficient thing, that again and again holds out promises of which, left to itself, it palpably denies the fulfilment, confronts men with a God who has made the world like this and knows it to be like this and who has now shown, at the very point where life seems poorest and most incomplete, that He Himself has consummated it and made sense of its nonsense, such sense as already, in this life, fills those who hear this Word with triumphant joy. This too is relevant for those who are not finally persuaded that life in the world, and above all human life, is, in itself, full and rich and self-explanatory, and that they themselves can, in their own strength, be what they would like to be.

F. N. Davey.

The Necessity of Scrutiny

Scrutiny, A Quarterly Review. Edited by D. W. Harding, F. R. Leavis, L. C. Knights, and Denys Thompson. (Deighton Bell, Cambridge.) 2s. 6d. per copy, 10s. per annum, post free.

For Continuity. By F. R. Leavis. (Gordon Fraser, the Minority Press, Cambridge, 1933.) 5s.

Determinations. Edited by F. R. Leavis. (Chatto and Windus, 1934.) 7s. 6d.

New Bearings in Modern Poetry. By F. R. Leavis. (Chatto and Windus, 1932.)

Fiction and the Reading Public. By Q. D. Leavis. (Chatto and Windus, 1932.)

After Strange Gods. By T. S. Eliot. (Faber, 1934.)

Phœnix : Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence. (Heinemann.)
Apropos of Lady Chatterley's Lover. By D. H. Lawrence. (Heinemann, 1930.)

Scrutiny was founded in the spring of 1932 by L. C. Knights and Donald Culver, but from its first beginnings it has been closely associated with Dr and Mrs F. R. Leavis and their circle in the University of Cambridge, though Dr Leavis has never been the sole editor. In their original manifesto the editors defined their purpose in words which have particular relevance for THEOLOGY, as it enters upon a new and, we hope, a useful phase in its history. "Every year . . .," they insisted, "intelligent young men and women go down from the universities and are swallowed by secondary and public schools. Their interests wilt in the atmosphere of the school common room, and isolation makes their efforts to keep themselves informed of 'the best that is said and thought in the world' unnecessarily depressing and difficult. Others besides schoolmasters" (some of the clergy, for instance) "are in the same position. *Scrutiny* has been founded on the assumption that a magazine in which such men and women can exchange and refine their ideas, and which provides a focus of intellectual interests, will perform a service attempted by no other paper." The continuance of *Scrutiny* for seven years, despite influential opposition, sometimes perhaps unnecessarily provoked, and a surprising paucity of influential support, seems to prove that even if it is only a small minority "for whom the arts are something more than a luxury product—who believe, in fact, that they are 'the storehouse of recorded values' and, in consequence, that there is a necessary relationship between the quality of the individual's response to art and his general fitness for a humane existence"—still that minority is prepared to take trouble to keep itself sensitive and informed.

Scrutiny has again and again been accused of debunkery and sheer negativism, but the negativism seems to me to be of that cleansing kind which is so particularly painful and particularly desirable to-day. Above all things we need a criticism which will not present us, as *The New Statesman* does quarter by quarter, with page after page of approved books. We all know in our heart of hearts that the novel of the year is nothing, that good novels in the best age were few and far between and are likely to be

rarer than ever at the present time, that escape is not literature. The vogue of escape dressed as literature is, from the spiritual and ascetical point of view, peculiarly depressing. None of us object to an afternoon's escape in a deck-chair with a thriller, if the activity is recognized as such. But most of us know how easily we can deceive ourselves into thinking that a very similar kind of activity with a very similar kind of book, done up in literary and moral-sentimental trappings, is not escape but uplift. Yet only rarely can we diagnose the danger with complete accuracy by the use of casuistical tools alone, and even then there is danger of misunderstanding.

I believe that the downright old clergyman who said of *The Fountain*, " Well, my boy, when I was a young man we just called it adultery and didn't take four hundred pages to say it," was saying more or less all that need be said about that particular piece of mystically-decorated sensualism. But suppose he had said the same about a novel of D. H. Lawrence? There is a great deal more than sensualism in Lawrence's attitude to sex; there is a world of difference between Lawrence and Charles Morgan. I do not think that any education in literary criticism is required to feel the difference. Indeed, one kind of literary criticism will obscure it by stressing Lawrence's carelessness and Morgan's careful grace, but another kind of literary criticism which can be found in *Scrutiny* will help us to express it in other terms than those of moral theology. For Lawrence's heresies, serious as they are, do not lend themselves to abstract definition. The simple application of a formula will not do.

Three of the essays in *For Continuity* are largely concerned with Lawrence. Of these the first is the longest and the best balanced, though it was written before the publication of his letters had revealed aspects of the man which the novels by themselves tended to conceal. But the other two have a particular importance for us because in them Dr Leavis begins to discuss Lawrence in conjunction and contrast with T. S. Eliot. He has continued to do so in reviews in *Scrutiny* since, notably in a review of *After Strange Gods* in September, 1934, and more recently in a review of *Phœnix* in December, 1937. Those of us who are theologically in sympathy with Mr Eliot may find Dr Leavis's tone in these discussions puzzling and sometimes irritating. It does not therefore follow that we can neglect to pay attention

to what he has to say about Lawrence and about Mr Eliot, or that we any more than he can avoid an attempt to find reasons for Mr Eliot's own failure of tone from time to time when *he* has discussed Lawrence.

For despite their protests against one another Lawrence and Mr Eliot share a common hostility to the modern world, as Dr Leavis quite rightly sees. Both saw behind the political and economic malaise of the post-war years to a deeper and more terrifying crisis which is more obvious now than it was then. Hence their preoccupation with anthropology, sex and religion; for civilized man has lost contact with the ritual of the changing seasons, of fast and feast, birth, marriage and death, with all that gave significance to the petty details of living. But while Lawrence believed that Christianity was at least partly responsible for the trouble, because the Christians had translated what was vital and instinctive into intellectual statements and moral commands, Mr Eliot came to hold that orthodoxy was right, but our perversion and distortion of orthodoxy had set us all wrong.

Inevitably this led him into a direct conflict with Lawrence. It would be possible to discuss complications which have obscured and distorted the real issue and still haunt the pages of *Scrutiny*. (Some of them might have been avoided if a trained and informed theologian could have intervened to explain the serious theological meanings of "diabolical" and "damnation," two words which Mr Eliot uses provocatively, but quite seriously.) What is more important for us is the tendency common to Dr Leavis and Mr Eliot to distort the nature of the fundamental difference between Mr Eliot and Lawrence by an overemphasis on the differences in their treatment of sex. Lawrence's lovers are significant of desires that go far beyond sexual satisfactions, but not always of his own attitude to "counterfeit sex" and "the sex of the cocktail" as revealed in the pamphlet on *Pornography and Obscenity* (reprinted in *Phœnix*) and in that very remarkable and revealing little book, *Apropos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Mr Eliot's poetry, on the other hand, has been concerned with the decay of human loves. Lawrence shared his disgust at modern cheap-and-easy attitudes, but communicated it more convincingly in the failures of his protagonists than in their aims. He made his lovers act as though they were on a religious quest, and so often made them unreal, or liable to arouse in some

people just that cerebrated attitude to love that he most wanted to avoid. No one who reads him with sympathy and understanding will make him directly responsible for the muddled sensualism of some who claim to be his admirers, but Mr Eliot's want of sympathy may have most to do with his own reassociation of religious and sexual imagery by another way, when he breathed new life into the elementary symbolism of sex, vegetation and religion, and saw Christ there, first dimly as a shadow among shadows at the end of *The Waste Land*, and more and more plainly since. Lawrence and he failed to understand one another, but it was unjust of Dr Leavis to see in his attitude to sex only the negation of Lawrence. What he denounced there Lawrence also denounced, and the implications of his imagery are very near to what Lawrence wanted to affirm of the union of marriage with the ritual and the rhythm of the seasons in *Apropos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

Doubtless there are other important differences between Eliot and Lawrence, about spiritual good and spiritual evil, about sin and death and hell, and doubtless Mr Eliot's increasingly articulate sympathy with the virtues of the poor, patience, resignation, courage and the power to cheer and comfort one another, would have repelled the rebelliousness of Lawrence against institutions and against scientific facts (what Mr Eliot calls his blasphemy), as it depresses certain revolutionary critics. But that has received sympathetic treatment in *Scrutiny* from Mr D. W. Harding, in a review of his *Collected Poems* in September, 1935. And I do not think that it was Mr Eliot by himself that was worrying Dr Leavis when he asked, "What *is* orthodox Christianity?" "Does a declaration of 'faith in death' mean a negative acquiescence in the drift of things here below, or, as it might, the opposite?" Mr Eliot by himself does not suggest a merely negative acquiescence, even if he has no formula for immediately effective action. It is the Anglican context that is worrying. What are Mr Eliot's admirers to think of a church where those who seem to be theologically equipped prefer the late Professor Housman, Mr Charles Morgan, and Miss Dorothy Sayers, to Lawrence, Joyce and Mr E. M. Forster? Nor is literature the only field where the clergy appear to lack critical discrimination.

This is not simply the difficulty of the intellectuals. It is the difficulty of the sensitive questioning individual in all ranks of society and at all levels of culture. He is far

more puzzled because Christians make the same kind of judgments as other conventional people than he is concerned to examine the validity of the hoary rationalist objections to miracles. It is not the past, the dead weight of dogma, the Inquisition and St Augustine, that is at all the primary problem. Indeed, medieval architecture and *The Pilgrim's Progress* require an explanation which may easily lead to a sympathetic attitude to those who believed in miracles, in immortality and in judgment. But such a sympathy, though it may lead men to value the Prayer Book and the parish churches, will not reconcile them to the sentimentality and cheapness of much modern Christianity, orthodox as well as unorthodox. If the Modernists are wrong about the real nature of contemporary difficulties, as I believe they are, it is not enough to be orthodox and to ignore them. It is not enough to be theologically in opposition to tendencies which, emotionally, we largely share. The Tractarians and Ultramontanes of the last century were theologically anti-liberal, but with the exception of Gerard Manley Hopkins and a very few others they echoed the taste of their own day. They praised Southey. They wrote the *Lyra Apostolica*. They patronized, but did not admire, the Metaphysicals. We are not faced with a *simpliste* substitution of theological for literary-critical standards. Theologically and ethically the Tractarians thoroughly approved of George Herbert. But it would no more have occurred to them that he might be a major poet or that Donne was a major poet than it occurred to them to doubt the grandeur of Milton. But if the Tractarian sensibility reveals limitations, the liberal sensibility reveals what Matthew Arnold was constantly exposing, a complete chaos of thought and emotion in the middle and the latter half of the century, criticized, but also illustrated, by Matthew Arnold himself. Arnold had read far more than Gerard Hopkins; he had far more time to think out his critical principles; he had genuine critical ability; but Arnold's criticism dates, while Hopkins's rare critical comments are as fresh and pertinent to-day as they were when they were written.

The problem descends to our own day, when the conditions of the problem seem to be changing. The drift due to the loss of standards which unself-consciously and naturally determined the nature of most men's response to art in the seventeenth century, and of some men's response in the

eighteenth and nineteenth and now, has gone on much further. The natural and unperverted good taste which enjoyed Bunyan and Cobbett and Thomas Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, is rarer than it was, though it is not wholly extinct and priests may come across it more often than other people. (It is not uncommon among ordination candidates of limited education and experience.) But the conscious reaction against drift which Matthew Arnold tried to initiate is a great deal stronger among intelligent and educated people, and a process of development and drastic revaluation has eliminated some of Arnold's major errors. Under these conditions it is not perhaps really surprising that while the clergy and laity of the Church find it more difficult than they did to apply theological and ethical standards to literature, those who are of the liberal tradition of humane culture seem more sensitive than they were. Theological and ethical standards cannot be applied alone. They can only discriminate with the aid of either natural or trained taste. And natural taste is both less common than it was, and more severely inhibited by education for examinations, and by the pressure of political and intellectual struggles which compel many people to think abstractly who in another age would have been free to observe and appreciate, or criticize, particular works of art; while the training of taste is not a part of education for which the academic or the scientific mind has any concern whatever. How many of us would consider seriously a suggestion that theological students should be tested to discover their capacity to evaluate, intellectually and critically, a new piece of writing not on an explicitly theological subject? Yet such a test would be far more valuable than elaborate information tests upon the source material in the Old Testament. It is in these circumstances that Mr Eliot has been obliged to devote energies which might have been given to literary criticism to the elucidation of problems which theologians and Christian sociologists have neglected. If these activities have injured his criticism and caused some to remind themselves of the deterioration of the Anglican Wordsworth, a truer parallel is Coleridge. Only, since Coleridge's criticism was always unmethodical, a matter of luminous islands in the haze of his conversation, the extension of his interests does not appear to have had any ill effects. In Coleridge we are not surprised by sudden transitions from literature

to theology and politics, nor does he try to hide them. In Mr Eliot's later essays it is the sutures between his interests that are weak, but nevertheless the political and theological comments are those of a great poet and critic.

And if the plight of the ecclesiastical clerisy is serious, and has had ill effects indirectly even upon Mr Eliot's criticism, the plight of the secular clerisy, of the inheritors of human learning in the tradition of Matthew Arnold, is in many respects more serious still. When *Scrutiny* was founded in May, 1932, the position looked hopeful. Assaults had been made upon the kind of literary opinion which had dominated the situation since the nineties. The Georgian complacencies had been seriously shaken. T. S. Eliot, Pound, Lawrence, Joyce and Hopkins were being accepted. A number of promising young poets were said to be on the way. But the poetic renaissance has misfired. Of all the young hopefuls only Mr Auden has displayed an interesting but exceedingly irregular development. Of Mr MacNeice, Mr Empson, and Mr Bottrall we must say, " the earlier poems were the best." Mr Michael Roberts, like Mr Murry, has slowly transferred his centre of interest from criticism and politics to philosophy and theology, while those who remain with the political left display an alarming tendency, visible even in Mr Auden, to go back to a modernized and Communized version of the characteristic attitude of Rupert Brooke. In this situation *Scrutiny* has stood firm, aware of the need of social revolution, yet strenuously insisting that no social revolution is worth while which perpetuates and intensifies the " chauffeur-mentality " of modern mass civilization; aware of the need of what Dr Leavis calls " the religious sense," yet insisting that *Essays in Order* do not contribute much to the understanding of literature as literature, and that " the impressive statement, in the abstract, of a coherent position is not enough."

Such a stand deserves sympathy and even admiration, but it has its own spiritual dangers. A negative reaction to political and religious *simplistes* has produced a tendency to treat all excursions from criticism into religious or political action as so many acts of treachery to literary criticism. This danger has become manifest not only in the unsympathetic way in which Dr Leavis has treated Mr Eliot's later criticism, where at times he does play the amateur theologian or sociologist to the detriment of his

concentration upon the strictly literary-critical side of the job, but in the kind of criticism which has lately been given to Mr Auden. No one has suffered more from the over-adulation of admirers than Mr Auden has. No one is more in need of real and discriminating severity. But he has survived ordeals which have reduced Mr Day Lewis to a political pamphleteer and Mr Spender to a latter-day romantic, and he deserves something more constructive than Dr Leavis has lately allowed him. If he has a real gift for light verse and can do it entertainingly, as he can, let us thank him for good entertainment and point out how it could be made better, not hold up our hands in horror because the Book Society happens to enjoy it too. *The Dog beneath the Skin* had a severe but a very just review from *Scrutiny*. *The Ascent of F6* was justly pilloried for some mock-Shakespearean lines, but it was a development, not entirely a wastage of talent. There was a personal outlook emerging, particularly in the first version (it was somewhat smothered in the acting edition), and this personal outlook which distinguishes Mr Auden from the rest of the *New Country* group has never received sympathetic attention from Dr Leavis. The fact is that Mr Auden is not really a liberal at all. His Communist disguise wears very thin, but his concern with the necessity of charity and the limitations of what violence can do is not the kind of " moderate " concern which restrains Mr Spender. It has roots in another tradition, one which recognizes, as liberalism does not recognize, the permanent limitations of all political plans and ideals here below. Mr Auden's preferences in poetry for Dryden, Pope and some Anglo-Saxon sagas may mark imperfect personal development in some respects. But they also mark an emancipation from romanticism. In many respects he is nearer T. E. Hulme's ideal of a classical poet than Mr Eliot is, and his emancipation from *New Country* bears a relation to the emancipation of Mr Michael Roberts, whose essays in criticism have also been scrutinized severely, and on the whole justly. But again Mr Roberts's *Modern Mind*, which was a real attempt to deduce philosophical and theological implications from data discovered by literary criticism in the language of the seventeenth century, was hardly fair game for Mr Michael Oakeshott, a known admirer of his enemy Thomas Hobbes. Nor is it enough for *Scrutiny* to say that in his *T. E. Hulme* he has exposed " the Hulme myth," when he

has shown that Hulme's confusions, serious as they are, are the confusions and contradictions of the present-day mind.

These criticisms of the best kind of humane mind in the Arnold tradition, as that survives in *Scrutiny*, lead us back to the present position of Christian taste. There is no reason whatever for complacency, but there are hopeful signs. I am thinking particularly of the kind of student whom I have often met in the last two or three years at Student Christian Movement conferences. Sometimes they are students of English, but by no means always. They are to be found in Oxford and Cambridge, but as often as not they come from the modern universities (one of the keenest supporters of a Christianity and Art course at Swanwick is from the London School of Economics). These people have perplexities of a serious kind. Sometimes they have left the Church; more often they remain there because they know that the real problems are not capable of a political or of an economic solution. Yet they find little help in the clergy or in Christian books. It is the liturgy, not the sermon, that they care about. They have discovered their own perplexities in *Murder in the Cathedral*, and gone to that over and over again to let it sink into them, and provide, not in itself a solution, but the self-knowledge that makes the insoluble soluble. From that they have gone on to the rest of Mr Eliot's poetry, to *The Waste Land* and to *Burnt Norton*, but they have not stopped there. If for one kind of person there is a passage from Lawrence to Eliot, where Lawrence rips open the outer skin of convention and Eliot brings understanding of the wounds he has made, for another there is a passage from Eliot to Lawrence, from the understanding, through *The Waste Land*, of the real relation between religious instincts and sexual symbols, to the integration of Lawrence's approach to the mystery of sex with the Christian and Catholic tradition.

There seems to be something particularly significant in this Christian interest in Lawrence now that his cultus among the intellectuals has largely passed, or survives in weird forms in the *Phœnix* magazine. The instances I have found, though not very numerous, do seem enough to constitute an indication of how the land may lie. In no serious sense can Lawrence's work survive if the religious sense which Dr Leavis rightly sees in it is allowed to die. He is outside the comprehension of London and New York, and the Nazis can only misunderstand him in the most

dangerous possible way. Yet " he alone cannot give us the religion for lack of which the human spirit withers." It is true that our politics and our art are substitutes for religion, and so is our religion. But the religious substitute for religion is not all counterfeit, any more than the artistic passion or the social passion is all counterfeit. And any impulse, however weak, which has found its normal channel has found there the only way to strength and health.

For the health of our Christianity we need sound and orthodox but sensitive and responsive theology, a theology addressed to the " best minds in the class " who are devoting their whole attention to these problems to-day. But we also need other kinds of criticism, and literary criticism more especially. We need *Fiction and the Reading Public* on our bookshelves, to remind us when we have been using Miss Sayers to escape from our problems. We need, even in theological controversy, the critical method of *Determinations*, keen to detect stock responses and bogus reactions. *Scrutiny* needs and indeed demands a healthy theology, but *Theology* cannot do its work without *Scrutiny*.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

The Christian Social Movement and Theology

I

IT is still imperfectly realized by churchfolk how strong and continuous was the social tradition of the early and the medieval Church. Equally in doctrine, discipline and action the Christians of those days took it for granted that the Church had a very great deal to say and do about the social conditions of the world around it. Perhaps this ignorance is due to the steady disintegration of that tradition during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when business, politics and public affairs increasingly ignored all religious influence, both in theory and in action, and religion in its turn thought such things outside its scope.

The nineteenth century, however, saw the revival of an interest by religion in the material affairs of mankind. In

the main it was primarily humanitarian, for the relief of distress, and therefore a matter for action rather than thought. The figure of F. D. Maurice, who saw the whole thing in the terms of theology as well as of practical effort, is a solitary one. At the time when Kingsley and the " Christian Socialists " were demanding pity in the name of Christ for the sweated home-worker and the agricultural labourer, when the slum parsons and the sisterhoods were doing magnificent social ambulance work, Maurice was the only systematic thinker who saw that the social problems of the times were due to bad theology and that a rightly understood theology was vitally concerned with man's social activities.

With the turn of the century and the continued recovery of the Christian social tradition it began to be more and more felt that mere ameliorative effort was not enough and that theology was at the bottom of the whole question. In 1924 and 1925 there took place at Birmingham the British Conference on Politics, Economics and Citizenship (C.O.P.E.C.), and at Stockholm the international Conference on " Life and Work "—landmarks in the Christian Social movement. Whilst still concerned with the failure of modern civilization to secure material comfort for all, owing to manifest social injustice, there was more perception that cardinal points of theology—*i.e.*, the understanding of God's will for the world —were involved. At Stockholm, whilst there was unanimity in indignation at evils and desire for their reform and prevention, there was disagreement on certain specific problems—pacificism, prohibition and birth control. It was evident to the theologically-minded observer that these disagreements rested ultimately on theological disagreements. The events of the succeeding twelve years, notably international events and the economic crisis of 1931, have driven all the world to see that men's ultimate assumptions about God, Man and Nature are all-important. So theology has at last come into its own in the Christian Social movement, and in their turn social developments have begun to react on theology.

G. C. Rawlinson, writing some twenty years ago, said: " The moral and spiritual history of the race is not worked out by mobs, but by quiet men in studies. All ideas are explosive."

The more those ideas deal with ultimate things the greater will be their power in the world. It is the business of theology to deal with ultimate ideas; and thus theology

becomes the most powerful motive force in the world. At the back of natural science, the development of which is the outstanding feature of the nineteenth century, both in thought and practical living, lies the assumption that its task is to describe reality. The slow, patient work of scientific research is to make thought conform to what there is in nature—to correspond to reality. In precisely the same way it is the task of theology to study the ultimate reality, which is God, in His transcendent being, His action in the world, and His will for the world. To correspond to such reality is "the proper study of mankind."

Whether it be on scientific or on practical grounds, theology is thus all-important. But it must be the right kind of theology and not a mere departmental science dealing only with a narrow field of "religious" phenomena.

II

The social movements of the last twenty years, and their assessment from a theological point of view, found dogmatic theology in a process of striking change. For several decades the influence of the theory of evolution, which dominated natural science, had made itself felt also in theology.

The history of the Jewish people was seen to be more striking than ever when the category of evolution was applied to it. Cultural anthropology and the special study of the Semitic peoples later added even more significance to the history of the Jews as a study in religious evolution. In a similar way Harnack and his followers were able to describe development within Christian belief and morals. Jesus Christ Himself, according to this mode of thought, was mainly conceived as the outstanding figure of an evolutionary development in religious belief and moral insight. Revelation was thought of chiefly as an inner illumination within the soul and mind of man as to the being and will of God.

The thought of this period very rightly related the substance and meaning of religion to that which takes place in the natural world. But it confused almost all distinction between the supernatural and the natural. In fact, some of its followers denied any such distinction. They failed to see the double course in the unrolling of history described by Bishop Henson in his recent Gifford Lectures.

" (Christian Morality) may not be isolated from the march of humanity, since that also is an inspired thing. The slow evolution of mankind out of the primeval state of non-moral animalism into the richly humane life of civilized society has enshrined a Divine purpose, and disclosed a Divine energy. . . . Civilization and Christianity are not to be identified though they run a parallel course and both have ultimately the same Divine Author. A perfect civilization and a rightly apprehended Christianity would harmonize, for the kind of social conduct required by Christianity is identical with that which the health and permanence of civilization demand " (*Christian Morality*, pp. 147, 151).

The word " parallel " must not be understood to mean two series of events, one of which is religious and the other secular or natural. The field or material in which the two processes are operating is one—Man set in Society—but there are two forces at work on man in all his activities, Nature and Grace. Their source, God, is one and the same; but they are two modes of His operation. This is not the place for a disquisition, still less a definition, on the subject of Nature and Grace; but, for the purpose of this article, it may be observed that the distinction rests upon the distinction theology makes between God as Creator and God as Redeemer. Nature, and human nature in particular, is seen and known only in its actual phenomenal forms, though man guesses at what it might be and ought to have been. Grace is the power of God operating in Man through Christ, and perceived by Man as restoring distorted Nature to its true pattern. For sociology Nature deals essentially with the temporal qualities and values, Grace with the eternal which penetrates the temporal yet still remaining eternal.

The evolutionary view was optimistic and took it for granted that there was steady moral and spiritual growth in man, and that it was only a matter of time for his increasing redemption.

It was typically Hellenic in its spirit. God was mainly conceived as immanent in His creation; and the impersonal element in reality was stressed to the neglect of the personal action of God. The reaction from this point of view had begun even before the World War, in the challenge issued by Schweitzer in *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. He showed beyond any question that the current picture

of Jesus Christ as the gentle ethical teacher was not true to the Gospels, and—he might have added—not true to the thought or history of the Church of the first six centuries.

The change in theological thought which marks the post-war period is due to a concentration upon the person, office and work of Jesus Christ as the incarnate Lord. He is conceived not as one figure—albeit the outstanding one—in an evolutionary process, but as something altogether unique, and not to be understood in any earthly categories. In Him, and in His effect upon history, the transcendental is emphasized. He is Other, though not wholly-Other, as some of the extremists say. His own life and His teaching are essentially matters of crisis and not of gradual evolution. For most contemporary theologians interest in the natural, taught by nineteenth-century theology, is retained, but certain extreme schools of continental thought have lost all interest in Nature and, indeed, practically deny that Grace has any concern with Nature. But for the more balanced theologians the retention of interest in the natural, along with their affirmation of the supernatural, has induced a revival of interest in the study of the Natural Law—that is to say, a study of the set forms of natural behaviour in Things and in Man, man considered both as individual and as organized into society. The term "Natural Law" would be better understood as the "Natural Order."

Doubtless the political confusion and economic distress of the post-war period have stimulated this emphasis upon the distinction of Nature and Grace: and it has led to a renewed conviction of the radical nature of actual and original sin. The neo-Calvinist assertion of the fact that man cannot understand God or himself until he has seen God in the incarnate Lord and normal man in the person of the Son of Man is a very necessary prophetic recall, but taken alone and in isolation from the doctrine of the Natural Law it is an insecure basis for a systematic theology. Grace must always be considered against the background and in the material of Nature.

To sum up the features of the theology of the past twenty-five years in its contrast to that which preceded it: God is essentially personal; His action in the world is by crisis, as much as by gradual evolution; revelation is given by God's action in history, and supremely in the action of the Incarnation, rather than by the inner illumination of man;

man's capacity for spiritual knowledge is grossly damaged and distorted by original sin. If the older type of theology is to be called characteristically Hellenic, the newer is distinctively Hebraic. The former is mainly interested in philosophy, the latter in history.

But it is of the genius of historic Christianity that it has absorbed and included both views. And there is no more urgent present task than that the adherents of both schools should find a synthesis by learning to think out the meaning of their Christian faith in one another's idioms of thought. Since the Incarnation is that in which they both unfeignedly believe, it is by a fresh study of that doctrine that they can gain agreement. Christ is Teacher and Example, but He is also Redeemer and the Maker of the new creation. That He was the divinely appointed Restorer of the world is befitting, says St Athanasius, because "He it was by whom creation was effected." He is the eternal Word by and through whom all things were made, and He is the light and the life of men. He is also the firstborn of all creation, who is before all things and in whom all things consist (John i; 1 Cor. viii, 6; Col. i, 15, 16, 17). The Redeemer of Calvary is also the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

No doubt the theological differences described above are differences of emphasis, rather than of dogmatic disagreement. But these differences are all-important when it comes to matters sociological. They determine outlook, and it is outlook that ultimately determines action and program. The outlook which sees the Incarnation as one item in a general revelation will tend to see its fulfilment in some aspect of the world order, either at the end of some evolutionary process or on one side of a social conflict. Those who stand for the Incarnation as an entirely unique order of revelation will see all world history as under judgment by it. On the first view the tendency is to use the revelation in Christ as sanction and support for moral standards derived from natural knowledge and happening; on the second, man is confronted by an absolute with which he has to come to terms. It must be added that these differences of outlook do not follow denominational boundaries, but that the variations we have described are to be found in the membership of every Church. As Tyrrell said thirty years ago, "the divisions in Christendom in the future will not be perpendicular but horizontal."

III

This long digression into pure theology is necessary in order that we may see clearly the movements of thought at the time when Christian sociology has begun to feel and to see that it must be founded on theology.

In 1937 there met the Oxford conference on " Church, Community and State," composed of official representatives from all the Christian Churches except the Roman Catholic.

Here, in even greater measure, the need and the want of theology were evident and expressed. But unfortunately the conference was preoccupied, indeed, almost obsessed, by the problem of totalitarianism and the dictatorships consequent upon that political doctrine.

It was, of course, impossible to avoid the realities of the present situation; but the Christian faith, with its long perspective of history and the breadth of its interest in the whole arena of life, ought to have reduced the proportion of thought given to the relatively ephemeral in favour of the things of more permanent importance. There was a startling neglect of Biblical thought, both of the Old and New Testaments, which might have steadied the conference in its preoccupation with the importance and significance of the present totalitarian crisis, for did not all the prophets from Elijah to Christ Himself declare the place of crisis in God's government of the world? And there was a strange forgetfulness of the course of the history of the Church, set as the Body of Christ in a world of alternating peaceful development and of war-producing and war-produced confusion.

The conference was, of course, convinced that the Church had a decisive rôle to play at this, as at any, moment of history; but it was vague in the extreme as to what it meant by " the Church," and showed an extraordinary lack of realism as to the Church situation to-day. It failed to take count of the complexity of the condition of a divided Christendom, with its differing theologies and polities, and the variety of relations between churches and states. The situation to-day both within the Church, and between the Church and Society, is unprecedented; and least of all should the present Church and World situation be compared to that of the time of the breakdown of the Roman imperial civilization in the fifth and sixth centuries.

There have been three stages of history in the *vis-à-vis* of

the Church and the World, in all of which both Church and World showed features special to the age.

(*a*) The Church of the first four centuries, a small convinced minority facing a disintegrating civilization. The theology of that Church was still in a formative condition. The outline of dogmatic belief as to the person of Christ had, it is true, assumed very definite form; but a great deal of the Church's belief in regard to Grace, to the Church, and to the Sacraments was still unformulated. Still more so was the moral teaching of the Church in respect of matters corporate and social, though its teaching about individual morals was emphatic and clear.

(*b*) The united (western) Church of the middle ages and the Christian civilization it had helped to form and inspire.

More important even than the outward unity of the Church was the uniformity of its theology. The labours of the Schoolmen codified and stereotyped both dogmatic and moral theology, so that over Western Europe a uniform type of doctrine dominated the lives of men.

The magisterium of the Church was enhanced in power by the fact that it was united under the single authority of the Pope, whilst in the secular sphere Europe was a conglomeration of petty states, even in the times of the evanescent union of dominions under powerful rulers such as Charlemagne. The general picture is that of a civilization which consciously owed and expressed obedience to Christ as a civilization, unable to discern any ultimate distinction between the religious and the secular spheres, though a proximate distinction was to be made in the doctrine of the two swords.

(*c*) The modern situation of disunited Churches with varying theologies facing a world in which the secular authority is organized and wielded by strong nations. A very large variety of Church and State relationship is to be found. National churches, such as those of England and Scandinavia; the international church of Rome; disestablished Churches with or without privileges and concordats; majority and minority religions within the same state; indifference, hostility or friendliness to the Christian religion: these make up a bewildering picture of the Church *vis-à-vis* the World to-day.

In the transition from the medieval to the modern age there is also an inward change of the relation of Christianity

to civilization quite as striking and even more significant than the outward. It is in the secularization of thought.

No longer is theology regarded as the supreme all-regulative science, as in the middle ages; but the various sciences and arts have proclaimed and won their autonomy. Philosophy and natural science no longer owe any deference to dogmatic theology; economics and law have shaken themselves free from any control by moral theology, in their claim to be positive sciences and arts. In the other direction theology has—or had until the later part of the nineteenth century—failed to take the findings of natural learning into consideration, leading, as Mr Belloc phrased it, to "the isolation of the soul."

Whilst we may deplore the intellectual and moral disintegration which has inevitably resulted, it was necessary for the development of the sciences that they should be granted such an autonomy—at any rate for a time.

Such are the three historical stages through which the relationship of Church and World has passed. How are we to assess the situation to-day? Are we to abandon hope of a Christian civilization, and, in face of the present crisis, to retire from any attempt to influence the world into a purely other-world religion? Or are we to see in these crises the inevitable dissolution of secularism, carrying within itself the seeds of its own decay—a dissolution that must take place before there can be a Christian reconstruction? Several events give us ground for a faith that it is the latter, and that a new fourth age is about to dawn on the Church in its task towards the World. There is the ecumenical movement, the sign that Christians are no longer thinking of their religion in denominational or national terms. There is the deep dissatisfaction among the intellectuals with the loss of all absolutes and the disintegrating effect of secularist theories. Within the Churches themselves there is the new combination of the "Faith and Order" with the "Life and Work" movement, to integrate Faith, Worship and Action into one whole, and to bring to an end the lamentable separation between theology and the practical life.

IV

What then is the present duty of Christians? It is of no use to contemplate what an ideal reunited Church might do with a great synthetic theology in a world that

suppose that there was a vigorous and well-informed body of Christian opinion in this country, spread through all grades of society. Yet it is only necessary to read the utterances of bishops and other dignitaries to see how far this is from being the case. With good cause, they are constantly lamenting that Christian opinion is neither vigorous nor sufficiently well-informed. And it is only too evident that in many respects the leaders in the Church are far in advance of their followers, whom they are unable to carry with them. Yet there is much evidence to show that the Church is using neither the secular nor the religious Press to the best advantage, and that until it does so intelligent Christian opinion will remain inchoate and confined to a small minority of the country.

The Secular Press

The year 1938, for example, provided many opportunities for influencing public opinion through the secular Press. The publication of the Doctrinal Report, whatever its merits, gave a rare opportunity of showing the public that the Church was not obscurantist, but had taken account of developments in modern thought. In the "class" newspapers, which include, for example, *The Times*, the *Manchester Guardian*, the Report was fairly summarized and commented on. But in what is known as the popular Press it was too often treated merely as material for harmful sensationalism. The year also produced *The Outline of a Reunion Scheme*, which was adequately treated in the "class" newspapers but did not receive enough attention in others. The same also happened with such pronouncements as "Lest We Forget," "Some Principles of Christian Doctrine," both the results of conferences between Anglicans and Free Churchmen at Lambeth Palace, and with an impressive report of an unofficial conference on religious education.

The Church has yet to realize how serious this position is. Compared with the popular journals, the "class" newspapers have a small circulation. While they number among their readers the minority of intelligent Christians, they leave untouched the great masses who are outside the Church, and who receive little information about it apart from sensational gleanings of episcopal utterances and accounts of friction in parishes. The harm that the Church

is doing to itself in addressing only the intelligentsia is immense. What is going on in the Church? What does the Church say about this or that?—these are subjects which, if handled in the right way, would find a response in the readers of the popular Press.

There may be a tendency in some ecclesiastical circles to regard the popular Press as purely sensational and not to think it worth while to see that these newspapers receive suitable information. If this is so, it is a gravely mistaken policy. There is a deep interest in religion among the readers of the popular Press. Those religious prophets of the penny Press, who contribute articles week by week, have the eager attention of a large public. Yet, for the most part, their writings are sad mirrors of the best Christian teaching. There is a wealth of sentimentality and of comfortable statements which are little more than "dope." And, with one or two notable exceptions, the religious journalist who can teach his readers robust Christian doctrine is all too rare.

Although there is a real demand for information on Christian matters, the public is too often regaled with tit-bits, such as "Choir Walks Out on Vicar," or "Aged Clergyman Weds Girl of Sixteen." No wonder that the masses of this country are ignorant of the relevance of Christianity to-day. This is, however, not the fault of the editors, who, with all the good will in the world, cannot provide their readers with information unless they are first supplied with suitable matter.

"News is Sacred" is a sound principle for journalists. It is not a bad one for the Church in its propaganda. And religious news, where it can influence public opinion and not merely inform it, should be so sacred that every care should be taken that it is not lost to the great masses who read the popular Press. Statements and documents containing weighty ecclesiastical pronouncements, as they come from the conference table or the dignitary's desk, stand little chance of being used to the best advantage in the secular Press. What is needed is material for the gallery as well as for the stalls, and material in a form in which it can most easily be used by the popular Press. This does not mean that the matter should be jejune or vulgar. But it does demand that it should be suitably presented for the highly specialized needs of a popular newspaper. Not all will treat the matter in the same way,

and there may have to be individuality of approach to the Press, but this work will have to be done if the Church wishes to make any great impact on the class of spiritual "untouchables."

In its propaganda the Church makes the mistake of regarding the Press as an entity. So it is, in a sense, but each newspaper is a distinctive part of a great entity. You may call a Press conference (it is often done for ecclesiastical purposes), and address, after a little flattery, the representatives of disappointingly few newspapers and news agencies. This is not the way to get the best results. Each popular newspaper, behind its glaring headlines and free insurance schemes, each "class" newspaper, has an individuality of its own, and the wise publicist appeals to this. To make the result of an ecumenical or other conference into "news" or "a story" is a highly specialized task. And until the Church undertakes this, it cannot claim to be making the best use of a Christian Press in a Christian country. The task is not impossible, nor need it in any way involve a vulgarization of religion.

As an example of the way in which a serious and complicated issue may be presented in terms that can be understood by the people, the statement of the railway companies' case for an alteration in the rates and tariffs is important. The public has been well informed about the issues, not merely because the railway companies have exceptional opportunities for advertising, but because care was taken that the issues should be presented to the public in the most suitable form. Compare with this the presentation of the Doctrinal Report, *The Outline of a Reunion Scheme*, and other documents which have been mentioned already. These were addressed to the intelligentsia, and the popular Press generally appears to have been left to make what it could of them. At any rate, the results have shown that any work of interpretation that may have been done has not been very successful. It is difficult to believe that the Church cannot reach public opinion through the Press just as effectively as the railway companies have done.

The Religious Press

In the religious Press there exists a variety of papers and magazines. The weekly newspapers are, in alphabetical order, the *Church of England Newspaper*, the *Church*

Times, the *English Churchman and St James's Chronicle*, *The Guardian* and the *Record*. All these newspapers are, in varying degrees, reviews as well as newspapers, and they attempt the twofold task of giving Church news and commenting on it and, which is equally important, of giving comments from their own particular point of view on political and other secular affairs. They thus provide an opportunity not only to create Christian opinion, but to inform and consolidate that which already exists. They are the organs of the Church, although independent of official control, and their *raison d'être* is to speak for Anglicanism and present the National Church to the nation.

But the hierarchy of the Church of England has yet to acknowledge publicly the value of the Church Press. And in this it provides a striking contrast to the Church of Rome. It is in no small measure due to the weekly Papist papers that Roman Catholic opinion is just what Anglican opinion is not: informed, vigorous and alert and, when the comparatively small number of Roman Catholics is taken into account, surprisingly influential.

The reason is not far to seek. The laity of the Roman Church are encouraged to read their newspapers. Thanks to careful teaching, there are probably few good Roman Catholics who do not turn to one or other of the organs of their Press, not merely for information on Church matters, but also for Church views. The bishops and clergy of the Roman Church support their Press in season and out, with the most admirable results for the strengthening of Roman Catholic opinion in this country. Therefore, although their Church may not be very strong numerically, Roman Catholic opinion is increasing in strength.

The Church of England is a "force" in the country, but it is a vague and undefined one, because it has taken little pains to create an opinion to support it. Anglican bishops have done little for their Press, to the impoverishment of the Church, probably because they feel that they cannot commend any one paper without showing a partisan spirit. It would be disastrous indeed if one bishop were to commend the *Record* to his readers to the exclusion of the *Church Times*, while his more "Catholic" brother, the Bishop of X, lost no opportunity of commending the *Church Times* and showed little favour to the *Church of England Newspaper*.

The diversity of outlook of Church newspapers does

indeed raise peculiar difficulties. We have the situation, for example, in which one section of the Church Press is suspicious of reunion with the Free Churches, while another is equally suspicious of advances made to the Orthodox Churches of the East. But despite these differences, and in face of what is, on the whole, a healthy lack of uniformity, there is no reason why Church Press activities which tend towards the creation and the informing of Christian opinion should not be encouraged. As is pointed out later, there are two activities required of Church newspapers. So far as these papers can reflect the religious influence of church-people in secular activities, they provide the Church with an evangelistic force that costs it nothing and is of the utmost value. So far, too, as they show the application of Christian principles to secular affairs, they are sharing in the teaching office of the Church. The Church Press, when it is not purely partisan, has a teaching function which needs to be brought to the attention of the laity. So long as nothing is done by way of commendation, a large number of Anglicans will continue to imagine that they are fulfilling the duties of intelligent churchmanship by taking their religious news from the secular Press. This is insufficient, for a secular newspaper can hardly be expected to approach political and other problems from an Anglican standpoint, and it can give only small space to matters of religious importance. So the Church permits its laity to grow up ignorant, for the most part, that reformed Christianity is capable of expressing opinions on current affairs, and unaware that Christian principles are relevant to secular policy. The absence of well-informed lay-opinion is deplored episcopally, but where else are the laity to find the material and stimulation for their minds if not in the Church Press? All too rarely do the voices that call for vigorous opinion direct the laity to those agencies that exist to form it.

This situation will, if it goes unchecked, grow more and not less serious in the course of the next few years. As a people, we are becoming more newspaper-minded and more truly conscious of our own democracy. Public opinion stands, therefore, a chance of being more fully informed and of interesting itself more thoroughly in the government of the country. If the somewhat vague movement towards "moral rearmament" leads to anything, it will influence the citizen to undertake his democratic duties more seri-

ously. It is being pointed out to him, both in Church and outside, that democracy is based upon the Christian faith, and cannot be preserved without it. This is sound and necessary advice, but it can hardly prove effective unless the Anglican citizen is told where he may find opinions, based on these principles, expressed week by week.

Every parish priest knows how essential it is for his people to grasp the fact that religion is related to common life. It is a lesson that the Roman Church and, to some extent, the Free Churches, have taught their people through their Press. Churchpeople must be told, not once, but many times, that it is their duty to read a Church newspaper of some description, and this can be done fairly and effectively without any member of the hierarchy laying himself open to the charge of bias. A conference of bishops and editors of Church newspapers would not find it hard to devise a way. It is difficult to believe that what the Church of Rome has done to its own great strengthening, the Church of England cannot also do. If the Church does not do it, it must be prepared for the consequences. The gap between the leaders and their followers will remain unbridged and grow greater, and what Anglican opinion there is will continue to be confined to a small minority whose intelligence does not make up for their lack of numbers.

The Theological Basis

But for the Church merely to pay more attention to Press activities, essential and urgent as this work is, is not by itself sufficient. Christian opinion is a vague term and more careful thought needs to be given to what constitutes it, and what purposes it is intended to serve. The Church's use of the Press, both of its own and the secular organs, is ineffective to-day because the spheres in which Christian opinion operates and the various activities of this opinion have not been carefully considered. Those who have read M. Jacques Maritain's book, *True Humanism*, will recognize, in what follows, the distinctions that he draws. He writes for the Roman Communion, but what he says applies to the Anglican Church in the work that it must undertake, or neglect to its own peril, of creating a body of opinion to support it. There will be few who will quarrel with his statement that " in terms of an effective realization of the

Gospel in the socio-temporal sphere, we are still truly in a prehistoric age." And those who most need rousing from their complacency remain inert because there is not a sufficiently vigorous body of opinion to brace them.

If we take the average Anglican as he should be, and for the purposes of argument we must assume the existence of such a being, it should be possible to discern three modes of Christian activity within him which should affect or be affected by Christian opinion. As a member of the mystical Body of Christ he should act on a spiritual plane. As a citizen of earth he should act no less as a Christian, but as one who is concerned with temporal things. Thirdly, there is a sphere of activity in which these two intermingle, and here will be found problems of politics, economics, education and so on. The good Anglican, however much he may disagree with his fellow on the method of application of Christian principle within this sphere, should at least agree with him upon the fundamental Christian principle involved. It is this last form of activity which is generally meant when Christian opinion is spoken about, though it cannot be wholly separated from the other two.

Bearing these distinctions in mind, we may turn again to the more particular problems of the Church and the Press. As regards the secular Press, the Church will find little opportunity of stimulating the first two forms of activity. It is the third which gives the Church most opportunity. And here will apply the comments and suggestions that have been made above with regard to the secular Press. How necessary they are is seen all the more clearly when one form of Christian opinion is understood to centre round Christian principle. It is precisely in this matter of principle, of theology, that the Church is so weak to-day. The zealous Christian reformer, in his attempt to create opinion and to set the world to rights, endeavours to win support for a particular application of a principle without pausing to consider sufficiently whether the principle is the appropriate one. As a result, the solid Christian opinion, founded on principles, is never created, and instead there grows up a series of discordant groups with competing claims and nostrums. And so the Church is presented to the world as a comprehensive rather than as an effective body.

M. Maritain would lay it down that there should be two separate types of religious periodical, the functions of which

should not overlap. And what he has to say about these is of the utmost importance to those who wish to see a more effective Church propaganda and a more impressive body of Anglican opinion. In one type of paper would be set forth the doctrines of the Church, in its speculative and practical values, "concerning the direction of human life and the incidence of the spiritual world in the temporal." In the other would be brought forward questions of the "temporal and cultural order." It would show the diversity of standpoints natural to the order, and the reader would be made aware of the attitude taken by men to-day, "and notably by Catholics [read Anglicans], in purely secular fields." Thus between them these two types of journal would cover the whole sphere of Christian activity. And if we add an intelligent use of the secular Press, then the entire community would be effectively covered by Christian propaganda.

At present the Anglican Press cannot be divided into these two types, although one or other of them is reflected to varying degrees in the weekly and other organs. As purveyors of ecclesiastical news they are efficient enough, and in commenting as religious newspapers on political and other events they perform a valuable service by showing that Christianity and Christian principle are related to contemporary secular events, and that contemporary secular events are, in the end, theological.

If they have one fault, it is not of their own making. On the whole, they probably do not pay sufficient attention to the impact of Anglican thought upon the "cultural and temporal order." This is an informational activity which is of the greatest value in stimulating Anglican opinion. The members of the Church Press may well reply to this criticism that they have to pay their way and cannot go too far in advance of their readers. That is a fair reply in the present circumstances. But the hierarchy should see that the Church Press is encouraged to develop its services to the Church, so that it may reach a wider public, and in so doing create that enlightened Anglican opinion, agreed in principle though differing, maybe, as to practice, which the Church of England so sorely needs to-day.

To sum up, remedies are urgently needed and should be sought for along the following lines:

An attempt should be made to establish closer relations with the popular Press. This should be done, not by a

collective approach, but informally, paper by paper. Thus a greater degree of co-operation might be established which would be maintained by the provision of material carefully prepared to suit the requirements of each newspaper.

When a document is drawn up which is intended to appeal to public opinion, the need for popular interpretation should not be forgotten. The Church cannot dictate to the Press what it shall say by way of comment or what it shall print by way of news, but more can be done to ensure that there is a suitable material for well-informed comment, and that the relevance of the document is made more apparent to the readers of the popular newspapers.

Both these suggestions point to a third: to the work of someone who might be described as a public relations officer of the Church, whose task it would be to carry out these duties within the framework of the present Church publicity services. It would be his business, not to create an official Church opinion in the Press, but to provide the material and, where necessary, the interpretation.

As regards the Church Press, steps should be taken to educate the laity to read a Church newspaper. And the Church Press should be encouraged to give, for the benefit of the laity, what cannot be found, in this form, in other newspapers—news and information which shows the application of Christian principles to secular affairs and thus help in the creation of a body of consciously Christian opinion.

But underlying all these suggestions, and, indeed, all the comments in this article, are two facts of a paramount importance: that the Church remains out of touch with the masses and, to some extent, with its own laity, and that the best collective method of approach to them, in the interests of religion and of the preservation of Christian democracy, is through the secular and religious Press.

GUY MAYFIELD.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. F. N. Davey is Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; until recently he was also vicar of St Benedict's church. He was joint-author, with the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, of *The Riddle of the New Testament.*

The Rev. Reginald Tribe is the Director of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, and Brother George Every is a member of the same Society.

The Rev. A. C. Scupholme is assistant curate of Helmsley, York.

The Rev. Guy Mayfield is assistant editor of *The Guardian.*

The second of the two surveys in this issue has been contributed by a correspondent in France, who is kindly going to send us a series, which will appear at intervals, on the work of contemporary philosophers and theologians in that country.

NOTES

The first of a new series of *Theology Occasional Papers* has been published. It is entitled *Infant Baptism : History and Modern Practice*, and is the joint work of a group of younger clergy in the rural deanery of Poplar. The subject is one of grave and urgent importance, about which there is much crooked thinking. This Paper (S.P.C.K., 1s.) will form a useful basis for a fresh consideration both of the theology of baptism and of the need for drastic reform in its administration.

KARL BARTH AND DEMOCRACY

The current issue of *Radical Religion*[1] (Winter, 1938) publishes the following quotation from a letter which Karl Barth wrote to a professor in Prague on September 19 last :

" Has the whole world come under the bewitching power of this huge serpent ? Must the post-war pacifism really end in such a terrible paralysis of the courage needed for decisions ? I still dare to hope that the sons of the old Hussites will show sloppy Europe that some real men still exist in this world. Every Czech soldier who will then fight and suffer will fight and

[1] *Radical Religion* is an American quarterly devoted to Christianity and social reconstruction. It deserves to be more widely known in England than it is at present. The English agent is the Rev. Arnold Nash, 35, Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1, from whom copies can be obtained. The subscription in England is 4s. per annum.

suffer for all of us and—I say this without reserve—also for the Church of Jesus Christ, which in the midst of such Hitlers and Mussolinis will either decline into ridicule or will be wiped out."[1]

The editor of *Radical Religion* is Reinhold Niebuhr, who will shortly be arriving in Scotland to deliver his Gifford Lectures. We think that his editorial comments on the above letter will be of interest to our readers:

" We find these judgments astonishing, though we agree with them politically. They are astonishing because they come from a man who has spent all his energies to prove that it is impossible to mix relative political judgments with the unconditioned demands of the Gospel. Nothing discredits Barth's major theological emphasis more than his complete abandonment of his primary thesis in the hour of crisis. Just as Einstein's two per cent. pacifism was discredited when he called for a war against Nazi Germany. We agree neither with Barth's previous separation of the Gospel from fateful political and historical decisions which we as men must make, nor yet with his present identification of the Czech soldier with the liberty of the Church of Christ. Surely Barth ought to be the last man to believe that the Church ' will be wiped out ' if the Hitlers and Mussolinis are not defeated. It may be forced into the catacombs, but the more the ridiculous Cæsar-gods rage the more apparent it will become that Christianity is true and that it is the ultimate truth. The majesty of God is most perfectly revealed in the moment when the Christ is crucified. The gates of hell cannot prevail against this Church.

" But the Church against which the gates of hell cannot prevail is not any particular historical institution. Nor is its future determined by whether men will save democracy against fascism. On the other hand, it is quite true that the fate of a Christian civilization may well be decided or could have been decided by Czech soldiers. There is a difference between a civilization which seeks to build itself on the Gospel foundations and one which explicitly defies the Gospel. This difference is tremendous and it is worth fighting for. Those who believe that Greek culture would have survived if the Greeks had not defeated the Persians at Salamis have never been able to present very plausible arguments for their convictions. A culture lives in a civilization; and a civilization is a physical thing which can be destroyed and can be saved. But a culture is nothing more than a rationalization of a civilization if it is not also the fruit of a religion which is not primarily concerned about the future of cultures and civilizations.

" Here again Barth, the exponent of dialectical theology, has

[1] The full text of this letter in a French translation, together with some subsequent explanations by Barth himself, is published in *Foi et Vie*, 1938, No. 4 (139, Boulevard Montparnasse, Paris, VIe).

proved himself to be not sufficiently dialectical. In all the years before this crisis his ' no ' to the problem of culture and civilization was too unreserved, and in the hour of crisis his ' yes ' is too unreserved."

COMMENT ON PERIODICALS

(*a*) Theological

Readers of Theology are aware, through the survey by Dr Cross in the January number, that theologians are on the track of the logical positivists. The December number of *Christendom*[1] contains the second part of an article on these attractive thinkers, by D. M. Mackinnon. He says that " only the Barthian can accept with equanimity " their " refusal to allow sense to any talk whatever about the divine," and he asserts that " the elimination of metaphysics is before all else an assault on man in the interests of a method." Like communism and fascism, the movement desires to subordinate man to something which is less than God; the Absolute to which all reason is required to submit is the scientific method.

An excellent article by Christopher Dawson, " The Social Factor in the Problem of Unity," is reprinted from the *Colosseum* in the December number of the *New American Church Monthly*.[2] The writer first shows that heresies have often been rooted in social conflicts, and then asks whether this fact throws any light on the problem of Christian unity to-day. " Heresy and schism," he says, " have derived their main impulse from sociological causes, so that a statesman who found a way to satisfy the national aspirations of the Czechs in the fifteenth century, would have done more to reduce the centrifugal force of the Hussite movement than a theologian who made the most brilliant and convincing defence of Communion in One Kind." Therefore the first and greatest step towards religious unity is to purge the mind from lower motives which may contaminate our faith. The hostility which now threatens Christianity may help us to see that deeper than all social divisions is the opposition between the world and the Kingdom of God; to grasp that fact is to move towards unity.

Dr Kraemer's book *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* has shown the alterations in missionary policy, which may follow a too eager acceptance of the doctrines of Karl Barth. This book is the subject of an article by Dr D. S. Cairns in the January number of the *International Review of Missions*,[3] and

[1] Basil Blackwell. 2s. quarterly. [2] Temple Publishing Corporation. 25c. monthly. [3] O.U.P. 3s. quarterly.

of an article by E. C. Dewick in the corresponding number of the *East and West Review*.[1] Both these writers protest against the view that the heathen religions contain no vestiges of truth, and question the wisdom of reversing the established policy of missions in finding and utilizing points of contact between Christianity and other religions.

The January number of *Blackfriars*[2] has an unpublished essay by Fr Bede Jarrett on "The Holiness of Truth." In it he shows, by quotations from the works of St Thomas, in what way the saint regarded his own life of teaching and preaching as worth while. "He came, partly perhaps for his own comfort and as an inspiration to his inner life, to insist on what I have called the holiness of truth. Scattered through his works are evidences of how he was at pains to insist to himself as it were, on all that knowledge can do to make a man the better lover of God." That is a precious theme, and St Thomas's meditations on it repay such careful and loving study as they receive in this article.

A. C. SCUPHOLME.

(*b*) LITERARY

The Criterion, edited by Mr T. S. Eliot for the past sixteen years, ceased publication with the issue of the January number.

In his "Last Words" (in place of the customary editorial commentary), Mr. Eliot makes one or two explanatory remarks on what *The Criterion* has been trying to do. Its purpose can partly be understood by the fact that "only from about the year 1926 did the features of the post-war world begin clearly to emerge—and not only in the sphere of politics. . . . Here in England, a definitely post-war generation began to speak." What this post-war generation has had to say has been expressed mainly in the reviews of "Books of the Quarter"—a regular feature of *The Criterion*. The reviews in question have been of greater significance for *The Criterion's* purpose than many of the articles. They have been written by those who hold very different ideas, and from within the context of a society which is experiencing the birth pangs of a new and vastly different order of things. The reviewers have had something definite to say, which, but for *The Criterion*, might never have been said at all. And what they have said is the more interesting in that some of them have been in a transitional stage, the final move of which has been the acceptance of the Christian faith.

The wisdom with which the reviewers have been selected to deal with diverse material is highly commendable. For this task alone, Mr Eliot is to be congratulated; and the consequence of this careful selection has been to increase the intellectual

[1] S.P.C.K. 1s. quarterly. [2] Basil Blackwell. 1s. monthly.

interest of *The Criterion*. As an illustration of the last remark, might be mentioned Mr Michael Roberts on *The Christian Challenge Series*, Mr Louis MacNeice on G. M. Hopkins, Mr Montgomery Belgion on Somerset Maugham, and Mr Middleton Murry on Jacques Maritain.

The articles which *The Criterion* has produced, while not as important as the book reviews, are nevertheless interesting, mainly because they are an indication of the growth of the editor's interest and the scope of the Quarterly. They include, amongst others, P. Mansell Jones's "Where Modern Universities are Wrong," F. S. Flint's "The Plain Man and the Economist," and H. S. Swabey's "The English Church and Money." The final issue contains Henry Miller's "The Absolute Collective," a provocative exposition of a provocative book of the same title by Erich Gutkind, in whom Mr Miller seems to recognize a second Lawrence. There is also an appreciative review of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's *Cambridge Sermons* from the Rev. R. Newton Flew. Bro. Every's review of Mr Middleton Murry's *Heaven and Earth*, and that of Mr Philip S. Richards on Maritain's *True Humanism*, both demand special attention.

And so, while bidding *The Criterion* a regretful farewell, we note Mr Eliot's remark that "the continuity of culture may have to be maintained by a very small number of people indeed . . . it must be the small and obscure papers and reviews . . . that will keep critical thought alive and encourage authors of original talent." Both *Purpose* and *Scrutiny* are attempting something of what Mr Eliot suggests. The latter review receives a bouquet from "Penguin" in the January issue of *Blackfriars*, while *Colosseum* is rapped on the knuckles for its interest in "the sentiments of traditionalist Continentals . . . at the expense of English Catholic criticism."

Nov. H. Smith, S.S.M.

Note.—Since going to press we are glad to learn that Mr. Eliot intends periodically to continue his "Commentary" in the pages of the *New English Weekly*.—Ed.

SURVEYS

(A) BOOKS FOR THE CLERGY

The literature available for review under this heading in the present number consists, with two exceptions, of volumes of sermons. Since one can hardly imagine that the laity devote much of their time to this particular type of reading, one is somewhat reluctantly driven to the conclusion that this is the proper place for reviewing them; though, in the present state of Anglican preaching, one doubts whether it would not be better for us all if we were told to go away with our Bibles and work at that until we were given a word of God which we felt constrained to deliver as best we could.

Not that the reading of other men's sermons and the using of their material is an illegitimate or unprofitable pursuit. Professor Collingwood has recently protested with vigour against the vulgar commercialism of the nineteenth-century code of artistic morality which made plagiarism into a crime. "It is obvious," he says, "that a man who can be annoyed with another for stealing his ideas must be pretty poor in ideas, as well as much less concerned for the intrinsic value of what ideas he has than for his own reputation. . . . Let all such artists as understand one another, therefore, plagiarize each other's work like men. Let each borrow his friend's best ideas, and try to improve on them. . . . Or if he cannot improve on them, at least let him borrow them; it will do him good to try fitting them into works of his own, and it will be an advertisement for the creditor. An absurd suggestion? Well, I am only proposing that modern artists should treat each other as Greek dramatists, or Renaissance painters, or Elizabethan poets did."

There must be few of us clergy who have not in a humble way followed his advice: and we know well how a seed which has fallen into the soil of our mind from another man's thought has germinated and taken root and blossomed, not into one sermon, but into a whole train of reflection and study which has enriched all our subsequent presentation of Christian truth.

There is a further reflection suggested by the volumes before us. One of the most stultifying effects of our unhappy division is the tendency to "denominational reading." There are too many Anglicans who have never opened a book by Professor Dodd or Professor Herbert Farmer. The same thing will be true from the other side. Whether sheer ignorance or fear of contamination be the cause, the result is equally unfortunate. A little cross-fertilization of our Anglican strain, at any rate in the matter of preaching, would do us a world of good.

Let us begin with the Romans. There are two volumes of

collected addresses here, one by the hermit-missionary of the Sahara, Charles de Foucauld (*Sermons in the Sahara*, Burns Oates, 2s. 6d.), the other by Canon J. F. Arendzen (*Faith and Common Sense*, Burns Oates, 6s.). There is about both of them a simplicity and directness of presentation which are refreshing. Fr de Foucauld in particular has a real power of presenting theological truth in a form which would make it intelligible to very simple people. The Protestant reader must of course be prepared for some surprises: it does sound a little strange to read: " This religion which God has taught to mankind . . . is called the Catholic religion: ' Catholic,' that is universal, because it is to be believed by all men everywhere. It is also called Christian. . . ." With this interpretation of " Catholic " the inversion of order may not mean much. The possible consequences of it are revealed in a passage in one of Canon Arendzen's sermons, " No doubt it is to prayer that we owe the triumph so far of that noble Christian hero, General Franco."

Presbyterianism is represented by a collection of sermons preached by Scottish theological professors (*The Professor as Preacher*, James Clarke, 5s.). The collection is, as all such collections are bound to be, uneven in quality. But it contains some sermons, notably those by Dr Cairns and Dr W. M. Macgregor, which are typical not only of the men but of the finest tradition of Scottish preaching. There is an edge on them.

Of the Anglican volumes the most important is a reproduction from notes taken by one of his hearers, of some *Parochial Sermons of Bishop Chavasse* (S.P.C.K., 5s.). No one who knows anything of the place which Bishop Chavasse holds in the tradition of St Aldate's, Oxford, in which these sermons were delivered, can fail to recognize that these outlines, even though they have been carefully collated with the actual sermon notes, are but a pale reflection of the original utterances. But there is at least this advantage about the form in which they are here presented, that it shows something of the structure, the careful working out point by point of the argument of the sermon. And even in this form one can feel the penetrating insight into human nature, and the mastery of Biblical exegesis, even though a somewhat old-fashioned one to modern ears, which meant so much to those who heard them.

There are two other volumes which deserve particular notice. The first is a series of short essays, *What Think Ye?* (E. L. Allen. James Clarke, 2s. 6d.), which, in spite of the publisher's deplorable recommendation that they are " bang up to date," do contain some clear and penetrating insight into the essentials of Christian faith. There is, perhaps, rather over-much recondite quotation for a book which is admittedly popular in its aim. One would like to see Dr Allen, who is Lecturer in

Theology in the University of Durham, try his hand on a considerably larger scale.

The other is a series of addresses delivered at various summer schools for ministers in the Southern States by Dr William Adams Brown (*The Minister : his World and his Work*. T. and T. Clark, 7s.). The setting of the addresses is naturally the American rather than the English scene; and Dr Adams Brown has some interesting things to say about the conceptions of the Church's task in the world, respectively held by Rome and Protestantism, in that setting: there is a welcome plea, for instance, for the setting up by the Protestant Church of a research bureau to investigate the social task of the Church, on a scale comparable with that of the corresponding Catholic organization.

The book is marked throughout by that genuine devotion to the ecumenical ideal which one would expect from its author. It is a little surprising, and disappointing, that in such a book, containing as it does a valuable chapter on " The Minister as Priest," there is no single mention of sacraments.

F. A. C.

(B) FRANCE: M. BLONDEL'S PHILOSOPHY

M. Maritain is no doubt better known outside his own country than any other French Catholic philosopher. But there are other names, not less important than his, that ought to be known to the British public, and of these the first is that of M. Maurice Blondel. The spontaneous outburst of acclamation with which he was received at the Congrès Descartes in 1937 was an indication of the high regard which is felt for him by his colleagues and pupils. But his influence has extended far beyond the circle of professional philosophers. He has had a profound effect upon the thought of the most intelligent clergy; instruction given in the seminaries, especially in regard to apologetic, has had inevitably to reckon with his teaching. This Catholic, whom the Church has never disowned, has found in the ranks of the theologians ardent supporters and no less ardent opponents; he has left none of them indifferent. For a general introduction to his philosophy, and for an account of the reactions it has aroused, there may be recommended among other studies the work of an enthusiastic disciple, M. Paul Archambault,[1] general editor of the *Cahiers de la Nouvelle Journée*, in which the inspiration of the master can be felt.

[1] *L'œuvre philosophique de Maurice Blondel* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1928).

M. Blondel began his career as a writer in 1893, when he published the famous thesis, which he submitted for his doctorate, entitled *L'Action*. This book has proved to be his masterpiece. The first edition has long since been sold out and it is unprocurable, but he has recently published a new two-volume edition with revisions and additions, less attractive, perhaps, than the original, though more definite.[1] With a rare wealth of thought and style the author develops the "moralism" of Newman's *Grammar of Assent* and of L. Ollé-Laprune's *La Certitude morale*. Recognizing the insufficiency of speculation divorced from life, *L'Action* boldly extends the normal range of philosophical discussion and aims at investigating a whole body of complex facts that are usually left out of account in technical studies. Of these facts the chief are as follows: (1) The incapacity of thought to restrict itself to its own peculiar sphere, and its paradoxical immersion in a reality which at once supports, directs and nourishes it; (2) the insufficiency of the will, which can neither renounce its characteristic impulse nor accomplish all that that impulse demands, trying, as it does, in vain to make its faculty of volition (*force voulante*) coincide with operation that is willed (*exécution voulue*); (3) the incapacity of human nature to fulfil itself on the natural plane and its desire, inevitable but powerless, for a divine grace.

This analysis, which was intended to exhibit the fact and the significance of human distress, was called the "method of immanence"; for its fundamental axiom was that "nothing can enter into man which does not in some way correspond to an already existing need." But by the method of immanence Blondel established a doctrine of transcendence, for, according to him, what alone could meet the interior appeal of the soul was the infinite reality of the divine, the Christian revelation, and the supernatural life, which we look for without being able by ourselves to discover or to produce them.

M. Blondel's thought moves on the borders of two ranges of study, where theology and philosophy meet, and it is abundantly suggestive. Even its separate and scattered details are of the utmost value. *L'Action* is undoubtedly a great book; it is packed with matter, and it contains continual repetitions that are also continually fresh, which remind us of the writings of Leibniz, for instance, and which incidentally constitute their difficulty.

In view of the discussions which were provoked by the first edition of his book, the author undertook in a *Lettre sur les exigences de la pensée contemporaine en matière d'apologétique* (1896) to clarify certain obscurities. But the controversy became so

[1] Paris, F. Alcan, 1936-7.

violent and, from the Catholic point of view, so dangerous, that subsequently he thought it best to keep silence, and he spent many years in the patient and laborious preparation of the works which would clear up misunderstandings. He did, during this time, publish a number of articles and fragments, and he took part in many " symposia "; but more than thirty years elapsed before there appeared one after another *La Pensée* (2 vols., Alcan, 1934), *L'Etre et les êtres* (1935), and the second edition of *L'Action* (1936-7); *L'Esprit chrétien* is yet to appear.

The main theme of all these books is that which has been outlined above. As an example of the way in which it is worked out, we can best turn to the book which contains more previously unpublished material than the others—viz., *L'Etre et les êtres*. From the opening chapters onwards we notice the subtle employment of a dual method which is one of the most interesting characteristics of M. Blondel's work. He is like an organist who plays all the time on two manuals. He finds being only through experiment (*recherche*) and process (*devenir*), and he conceives experiment and process only on the basis of existence and plenitude of being. This duality has in fact manifold applications: there is not only the duality of Being and beings, there is also that of thought and reality, and that of history and ontology, so that if at one moment M. Blondel may appear close to Spinoza, at the next he may seem next of kin to Kierkegaard. His whole synthesis retains a rhythm of intentional oscillation and incompleteness. Some critics see in this a grave defect, but he himself regards it as a sign of the faithfulness of his speculation to our human conditions.

The first part of the book is called, *A la recherche de l'Etre : découvertes et déceptions*. English readers will be reminded of the first hundred pages of F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*, notwithstanding differences of language and of perspective. The various levels of experience are criticized step by step, and declared to fall short of that absolutely necessary and self-sufficient Being of which we have a primary assurance.

Before even beginning his inquiry, M. Blondel says that the idea of non-existence (*néant*) is a pseudo-idea (p. 44); in refusing to treat it as a starting-point for a dialectic, he does not add very much to the teaching of St Thomas Aquinas, Spinoza and Bergson. He does not reckon with an idea similar to, but distinct from, non-existence—viz., annihilation (*anéantissement*), or *Sein zum Tod*, which Heidegger, for instance, has boldly undertaken to make intelligible. There are, however, points of comparison between Blondel's description of human distress and the anguish of extremity or death as we meet it in the thought of K. Jaspers or M. Heidegger. Why has not Blondel attempted to define the place of destruction or suppression in

the conquest of Being? Why, indeed, has he never yet really looked at it with a view to analysing it?

Having rejected, too hurriedly in my opinion, the notion of existential disappearance (*évanouissement*), he examines the first being that offers itself as a candidate for Being, namely matter. Like Bradley he proves the impossibility of an absolute and ultimate materiality, but he parts company with the idealists on at least two counts: on the one hand he admits that matter has the function of a stimulus, " at once partially docile and usefully refractory " (p. 81); and on the other hand he acknowledges that, though materiality does not confer reality on beings, it receives from them a reality that is true and even indelible (p. 83).

Next to matter there is the living body which is a triumph of unity and integration over the hitherto anarchic potentiality (*virtualité*) of the elements. But life cannot have the permanence which is proper to being. On the contrary, it exhibits in tragic fashion the groaning and travailing of creation.

It might be expected that at least the world of persons, with their mortal and immortal needs, would at its highest realize that consistent and divine order of which there is a presentiment in nature. But with a pitiless austerity Blondel shows that *en nous* we are not absolutely *chez nous*. " The edifice of personality seems to be made of dust, and nothing is available with which to cement it into a lasting and final form " (p. 103). The unity of the self is only an approximation, if not an artifice; at least, it is so when we limit our perspective to our own human destiny, even if this destiny is conceived as a collective one. Blondel's distrust of " personalism " derives in an unforeseen manner from his faith as a Catholic or, to be exact, from inferences that he draws from the doctrine of the Trinity: " How can we expect that personality, which in God Himself is insufficient to constitute being, will already be complete being in us? . . . Among the profitable suggestions that theology has to make to philosophy, one of the most important is . . . this fundamental distinction between personality and the substantial being of spirits " (p. 99).

The *pars destruens* of the book concludes with a vigorous denial of the autonomy of the universe in either its physical or ideal integrity. This is one of the most suggestive points in Blondel's work, though it conflicts with one of the most tenacious traditions of the West. According to M. Blondel, Xenophanes bequeathed to us a disastrous habit when he taught us to unify the universal all (*le tout universel*). This metaphysical extrapolation is a monstrosity; to ascribe unity and the solid subsistence of a real being to the all is to contradict the testimony of all experience, both of consciousness and of science. The world is relative, open, contingent. The *êtres* of this world are not self-sufficient but

functional; they are double-edged; they are in search of a transcendence to which they cannot completely attain. Even in a general consummation of its history in the distant future, the world would not exhaust its own content; it can neither throw off nor bring to fruition all the seeds of perfection which it contains.

The second part of this work tries to fathom the notion of absolute being. An attempt is made to prove, on the one hand, that "agnosticism is not an answer" (p. 107), and, on the other hand, that the philosopher has grounds for suspecting the presence of love in the Absolute Being. The God of the Old Testament defines Himself as: "I am that I am." Ought we, as M. Gilson does in his Gifford Lectures, to regard this formula as the résumé of Christian philosophy? Would it not be more correct to say that it is only the résumé of Jewish philosophy? We define God in terms of Love. M. Gilson and M. Blondel seem to agree in regarding being and love as two homogeneous terms. I am not sure that they are right. Creative fecundity (*surabondance*) is not necessarily identical with creative love. And I notice that M. Blondel's statements on this point are accompanied by more reservations and qualifications than M. Gilson's (p. 193). Perhaps he is right in the interests of continuity not to break the connexion which allows us to unite without confusing, and to distinguish without separating, the *Dieu des philosophes* and the *Dieu des chrétiens*. I could also wish for some further clarification of the question whether, after the creation, there could be *plus amoris* and even *plus entium* without there being also *plus entis*. . . .

God's action is grace and liberality, and it remains a unity notwithstanding its variety: such is the argument of the third part. M. Blondel considers the means by which beings may find their final shape and consistency in Being. And he begins again to sketch a picture of the universe with a view now to showing not the gaps and discords in it, but the possibilities of fulfilment and the successive levels of attainment. Even at its lowest levels the universe is subject to a normative demand; by an inevitable vocation, as it were, it must choose either to transcend or to devaluate itself. In this respect the most elementary form of existence is an earnest of what will be, in the case of man, moral choice with its temptations at once fruitful and dangerous.

M. Blondel's immense hopefulness is moderated by two checks: first, the affirmation of a possible dissymetry in human destiny consequent upon the freedom and contingency of our situation; secondly, the impossibility of a complete and definitive fulfilment without supernatural grace and elevation. There is no assurance of personal immortality nor even of an absolute intellectual communion without the final warrant of divine revelation. This is the measure of the distance between facile

forms of ontologism and this philosophy, which is prudent even in its most daring flights.[1]

I cannot pretend in a short survey like this to explore all the avenues of this far-reaching philosophy. It may seem somewhat elusive just because of the multitude of its insights. M. Blondel's turn of mind predisposes him in this work to describe the destiny of the cosmos rather than to draw up an inventory of its forms. Within the world of humanity what interests him most is the genesis of a new order at the point where nature is transformed under the influence of grace. No doubt this book might have been more perspicuous and less encumbered with preliminaries and scaffolding. M. Blondel (like Bradley) often warns his readers that he has not yet got beyond the prolegomena; he lets himself be overcome by the wealth of ideas which he draws upon. But when it is borne in mind that the book is the work of an old man of seventy-five, who is almost blind, any tendency to irritation will yield to unfeigned admiration.

And there is a fine originality in M. Blondel's work; he does not construct, like some others, *a philosophy of religion* but *a religious philosophy*. He does not look at things from outside. He holds that it is possible, and indeed salutary, to combine by a mutual infiltration both thought and faith, and intuition and analysis. One of his services to the philosophy of our time has been to open up for speculation the area where there is neither commonplace certainty nor unverifiable fancy, but presentiment arising out of reflection—what Jacobi called *Vorahnung*. If he had done no more than institute a " method of probability," would he not on that account alone deserve the well-disposed attention of the English, for whom the memory of Bishop Butler serves as a constant antidote to the narrow rationalism of Descartes?

M. N.

[1] It is also to be distinguished from other too facile philosophical procedures—*e.g.*, from the definition of reality in terms either of universals or of particulars, as if both aspects were not necessary, as if reality was not where they interact, or rather intersect (pp. 433 f.).

BOOK REVIEWS

MITRE AND MUSKET. By B. Dew Roberts. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

John Williams (1582-1650), Lord Keeper, Bishop of Lincoln, and afterwards Archbishop of York, has gone down to history in an unenviable context as the man who advised Charles I, reluctant to affix his royal signature to Strafford's death-warrant, that His Majesty had a public and a private conscience. Miss Dew Roberts' biography, as fascinating as it is erudite, will do much to correct the impression which that incident has stereotyped; although it does not go so far as to bear out Gardiner's dictum, that "If Williams had been trusted by Charles instead of Laud, there would have been no Civil War and no dethronement." For Williams' judgment was not infallible: he had too much intellect and too little simplicity of purpose: he blundered badly on more than one occasion, as when he underestimated Buckingham as an opponent ("Buckingham," writes Miss Roberts, "had not the instincts of a statesman; but he had the instincts of an ordinary man for sensing dislike, and far more than the ordinary man's power of avenging dislike"), or when, as the prime author of the Bishops' Remonstrance, he played straight into the hands of Pym: he was not always strictly truthful, and was liable, when in a tight corner, to resort to quite unworthy shifts. Yet throughout his long and chequered history, his good qualities—industry, courage, affection and gratitude to his patrons, and consideration for the poor—"persistently extricate themselves from baser ingredients and rise unexpectedly to the surface." Miss Roberts asserts that "John Williams had not the spiritual gifts which draw souls to God." But that is a very sweeping statement, and it raises more questions than Miss Roberts seems to be aware.

Any biography of Williams is bound to exhibit Laud ("the little meddling Hocus Pocus") in his least amiable light, and therein to redress the balance of our judgment. "*Tubby, rubicund*, 64, *William Laud is a good man with a bad temper and no tact; a martinet, not a bigot*": this stage-direction from Mr Maurice Colbourne's *Charles the King* (1937: p. 36) does not unfairly represent the view which in our day is coming into the ascendant, and it is much too facile. Mr Robert P. Tristram Coffin's *Laud: Storm Center of Stuart England* (1930)—a work which, for all its crudities, has never had the recognition it deserved[1]—offers a more veracious because a less one-sided portrait. Miss Roberts, from the opposite camp, is not less

[1] It has now been remaindered, and may be had for 3s. 6d.

fair. " In remembering Laud's great qualities and steadfast faith, this almost venomous pursuit of a man whose religious policy he feared and disliked should not be forgotten."

But what was Williams' religious policy? That is not easy to discover from this book. *Mitre and Musket* is far more than a mere popularization of Hacket's life of Williams (*Scrinia Reserata, A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D.*, 1693), and the section on the Civil War in North Wales, in particular, embodies much original research. But it is evident that Miss Roberts is more interested in the political fortunes and misfortunes of her hero than in his theological convictions. A few hints are thrown out in the course of the narrative: there is a reference to " the instinct for toleration, which was at once the strength and weakness of his character " (p. 57), and mention is naturally made of *The Holy Table, Name and Thing*, of the moving of the communion table in St Margaret's, Westminster, to conciliate Puritan M.P.'s, and of Williams' friendship with the Ferrars. We are told that Williams " advocated a moderation rooted, as he believed, in sound scholarship " (p. 34); but we are also told that his policy was guided rather by expediency than by religious conviction (p. 57). The fullest discussion of his churchmanship will be found on p. 119, where it is contrasted with that of Laud:

> " Given a free hand, he would have made [the Church] more pliant, more comprehensive, and more worldly-wise. All toleration must have limits if it is not to sink into complete indifference; and Williams was certainly more tolerant to Puritan thought than to Catholic practice, or to anything in the Laudian ritual that savoured of Catholic practice. He saw the political dangers of the least compromise with Rome; he knew that to antagonize moderate Puritan opinion was to antagonize the temper of the people. But whatever his leniency or points of doctrine, he insisted on order and dignity in the forms of worship, as he insisted on order and dignity in his own household."

We should have been glad of further details. But it is evident that Williams' ecclesiastical standpoint is not the primary interest of his biographer. If it be true, indeed, that Williams " was a materialist in an age of spiritual stress " (p. viii), Miss Roberts is not, perhaps, unjustified in her choice.

Yet in that brief summary there is a clear indication of what, to us, must look like inconsistency. The same note is sounded in the Introduction: " Contradiction is inherent in the positions which he filled and the parts which he took. . . . He has a leaning to Puritanism; yet he beautifies churches and colleges with the carved work and stained glass of which the Puritans so strongly disapproved." But this inconsistency is itself

perfectly consistent with all we know of the confused and difficult character of the years before the Great Rebellion.

> Here lies wise and valiant dust
> Huddled up 'twixt good and just;
> Strafford, who was hurried hence
> 'Twixt treason and convenience.
> He spent his time here in a mist;
> A Papist, yet a Calvinist;
> His Prince's nearest joy and grief,
> He had, yet wanted, all relief;
> The prop and ruin of the State;
> The people's violent love and hate;
> One in extremes loved and abhorred.
> Riddles lie here, and in a word,
> Here lies blood; and let it lie
> Speechless still and never cry.[1]

" He spent his time here in a mist." (Paradoxically enough, the phrase is not inapplicable to John Williams, for whom, indeed, it was the sort of mist in which it is always possible to see quite clearly two or three steps ahead, although, beyond that, everything is obscured.) In the outset of a controversy, party alignments are never so neat and orderly and internally consistent as they have become by the time when all is over bar the shouting: there is all the difference in the world between what a battle looks like on the field, and what a battle looks like when reduced to a diagram in a history textbook. Such confusion is by no means peculiar to the seventeenth century: Mr Basil Clarke, in his entrancing study of the Gothic Revival in church architecture, has reminded us that Dean Close set up a stone altar in Christchurch, Cheltenham, in 1840 or 1841, while Dr Pusey considered the Ten Commandments to be of more value for church decoration than images or pictures or tapestry.[2] But it is the student of the seventeenth century who needs particularly to be warned against attempting to divide the ecclesiastical characters of the period into " Anglo-Catholics " and " Protestants," and to envisage them in those terms. Lord Acton, in his criticisms of *John Inglesant*, thought it unlikely that Foxe, the martyrologist, should have been " the favourite and characteristic author of such Arminians as the Ferrars ": from a nineteenth-century standpoint it was exceedingly unlikely, but it happened to be true.[3] Mr G. S. Haight has written a valuable article on *Francis Quarles in the Civil*

[1] *An Epitaph on the Earl of Strafford*, attributed to Cleveland (*Poems*, ed. J. M. Berdan, p. 184). [2] *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century: a Study of the Gothic Revival in England* (1938), pp. 99, 117 *n.* [3] *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, 2nd edition, p. 108; *cf.* W. K. Fleming, *Some Truths about John Inglesant*, in the *Quarterly Review*, July, 1925 (vol. ccxlv, pp. 130-148).

War,[1] taking as his text Anthony à Wood's apparently paradoxical description of Quarles as a "puritanical poet": he notes that, although Quarles was an orthodox member of the Church of England, his *Emblems* "are permeated with the fervid raptures of the Catholic mystics; the title-page is a picture of the Sacred Heart"; and, still more surprising, the book "has found its most enthusiastic readers for three hundred years among the Nonconformists Quarles despised." Laud himself—and here Miss Dew Roberts is either mistaken or misleading—was as tolerant of those who differed from him in matters of theological opinion as he was intolerant of those who differed from him on small matters of external observance.[2] And—perhaps most astonishing of all—Montrose was a Presbyterian. Yet, even in that age of spiritual stress and intellectual contradiction, party alignments such as posterity would recognize were already beginning to take shape: and it was a considerable embarrassment to the English Puritans that Calvin had habitually played bowls on Sunday evenings at Geneva.[3]

But contradiction was indeed the hall-mark of the period: and it would be an admirable thing if some ecclesiastical historian would make this the basis of a wider study. Should this task ever be undertaken, Miss Dew Roberts' Life of Archbishop Williams will be found extremely serviceable to its prosecution.

CHARLES SMYTH.

JESUS AND HIS CHURCH. By R. Newton Flew. Epworth Press. 6s.

In one way or another the question "What think ye of the Church?" is being put before men everywhere in these days. The three ecumenical conferences held at Oxford, Edinburgh and Tambaram during the last two years have made this abundantly clear. It is not surprising, therefore, that when Dr Flew, of Wesley House, Cambridge, delivered the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1938, and chose the subject "Jesus and His Church," he related his subject to the present situation, and particularly to the Faith and Order movement. But he presents his thesis primarily as a contribution to New Testament theology. One result is that what is in principle an objective study of the New Testament evidence for the idea of the ecclesia, and necessarily of the ministry of the ecclesia as well, issues in a suggestion that the problem of different interpretations of the ministry by different Churches should be shelved tempo-

[1] *Review of English Studies*, April, 1936 (vol. xii., pp. 147-164). [2] *Cf.* Mandell Creighton, *The Failure of Laud*, in *The Mind of St Peter, and Other Sermons* (1904), p. 96. [3] *Cf.* H. Hensley Henson, *English Religion in the Seventeenth Century* (1903), p. 38.

rarily in order to achieve more rapidly a greater measure of unity. There is a hint on p. 238 that there lurks behind this argument a dislike for a theory of apostolic succession, which should be universally repudiated—namely, that it is the transmission of power to rule despotically. But by his brilliant examination of the significance of the Apostles and of the authority given to them by our Lord, in Chapter X, Dr Flew has, in fact, recalled all forms of the ministry, especially the episcopal, to first principles, not to an avoidance of them.

It would be unfair to pick out this issue alone, as though the main body of the book were unimportant. That, most emphatically, it is not. In fact, now Hort's *The Christian Ecclesia* is no longer sufficient. We shall all have to read Flew's *Jesus and His Church* as well in future. The reason for this is largely that since Hort wrote the battle for the text of the New Testament has been fought out, and the revolution has taken place whereby the eschatology has been brought back into the centre of the picture. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* is a sign of the times, gathering up into itself the real achievements of the last half-century and pointing the way forward. Dr Flew makes valuable use of the volumes which have so far appeared, for instance, in discussing covenant, authority, call, follow, apostle. In fact, one great achievement of his book is that it helps to elucidate the language of the Church through a thorough study of the vocabulary of the New Testament. This elucidation occurs mainly in the first part, and particularly in Chapters III and IV, where the teaching of our Lord is re-examined under the title "The Idea of the Ecclesia in the Mind of our Lord," and it is here that the advance upon Hort's position is most clearly demonstrated. Yet, when all is said and done, the main conclusions are not radically different, as Dr Flew points out. Hort is not superseded, but here are additional arguments to prove that St Paul did not exaggerate when he affirmed that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it. These two chapters are significant for the Faith and Order movement in that here the purpose of our Lord to build His Church is proved before discussing the Petrine passage in Matthew xvi, and the argument for the priority of the question of the Church in discussions of the ministry is set out.

It is impossible to pick out all the good things in the book, but I suspect that the points which will count for most in the future development of the main problem will be those concerning the relation of the ecclesia to the basileia in Chapter I, and of the Word of God or the Gospel as constituting the New Israel in Chapter III. The conclusions to which Dr Flew comes are of immense importance for all attempts at reconciliation of Catholic and Evangelical principles in the Churches. Pre-

sumably the use of the words " idea " and " conception " is deliberate, but there is a danger that their frequent occurrence may suggest to those who use them casually that our Lord was working out a theory rather than redeeming something so concrete as the Israel of God. This is clearly not Dr Flew's intention, as is shown by what he says otherwise: but, for instance, the sentence " John had emphasized judgment, and the terrors of the coming Messiah, while Jesus poured the conception of mercy and self-sacrificing love into the idea of the Kingly Rule of God," makes one a little anxious. One might think that the reason for his conclusion about episcopacy was that he can afford to talk about bishops as an idea, whereas a large number of Christians (witness Bernanos' *A Diary of my Times*) have to accept them as facts.

J. A. Ramsbotham.

The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought. By Nadejda Gorodetzky. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Prince Myshkin and Father Zossima are familiar figures to English readers; we have been taught to regard them as representing a peculiarly Russian type of Christianity. In this profoundly interesting study Mrs Gorodetzky makes no such exclusive claim, but she shows, in abundant detail, how deeply Russian literature of the nineteenth century is penetrated by the ideals of meekness, humility, non-resistance, poverty and obedience. She finds them in the novelists and poets, not only in Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, but in Gogol, Nekrassov, even in Turgenev, as well as in the reformers, Slavophils and Westernizers, orthodox and atheist. With many of the latter the following of Christ in humiliation (whether or not His deity is acknowledged) is not only a personal ideal, expressed in the renunciation of social privilege, the sharing of the hard life of peasants and factory-workers; it is also a national ideal. Russia's destiny is to become " the most Christian of human societies," whose power is to lie in " sacrificial disinterestedness."

These writers were, with a few exceptions, alienated from the Church, and the hierarchy was on the whole suspicious of secular literature. Nevertheless, within the Church there was a parallel current of thought. In the " mystical ethics " of St Tykhon (the original of Dostoevsky's Zossima) and in the dogmatic teaching of the Metropolitan Filaret, the humiliation of Christ is central. Later theologians, Soloviev, Bukharev, Bulgakov, many of them laymen, provide " a theological interpretation and definition of what was dimly felt by the secular writers." They find the kenosis in the creation, and even within the life of the Blessed Trinity; it is completed in the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord; it is continued in the life of the Church.

Mrs Gorodetzky is more concerned with the " kenotic frame of mind " and way of life than with its theological interpretation (although she provides a very useful account of the latter). She goes so far as to say that it is important because, in Russia, there was no " doctrine " about it. But it may be suggested that without an at least implicit christological basis the " kenotic frame of mind " is in danger of a perverted denial of human culture. The manicheism of Tolstoy is a warning. Bukharev, that attractive figure, who resigns his monastic vows (and with them his academic office and even his civil rights) to enter the secular world and to marry, does so in pursuance of the task of sanctifying and " enchurching " the whole of life, because for him the self-humiliation of Christ is a work of redemption, the redemption of the universe.

Modern Russia, unless we may except the " underground Russia " of which we know so little, has forgotten all this. The " go-getter " has replaced the " fool for Christ's sake," and whereas for St Tykhon " Christ begs through the poor," the beggar of to-day, as Gide tells us, gets scant sympathy in Russia (Herzen said the same of Victorian England). But for the Russian Church in exile the problems raised here are more than ever living issues, and they are becoming increasingly actual for the whole of Christendom. Hence the importance of this book, which should be widely read by the theologian and the general reader.

J. D. C. Pellow.

Contemporary Continental Theology: *an Interpretation for Anglo-Saxons*. By W. M. Horton. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This is a book by a distinguished American theologian, which attains with very remarkable success a limited objective. It is a sort of theological guidebook, addressed to American and also (since, as he says, the English Channel is broader than the Atlantic Ocean) to English readers; and it will not need to be read by those who know at first-hand the work of Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Maritain, Gilson, Przywara, Barth, Brunner, Rosenberg, Hauer, Hirsch, Heim, Althaus, Nygren, Aulén, Masaryk. But to most of us it can be of the greatest value in helping us to get our bearings; for Professor Horton has a remarkable power of seizing on the essential theological points in each case, and presenting them in a series of sketches, which, though brief, never become superficial. Enough has been said. This is a piece of work which, within its limits of size, could scarcely have been done better.

A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.

THE PHILANTHROPIC MOTIVE IN CHRISTIANITY. An Analysis of the Relations between Theology and Social Service. By F. M. Hník. Translated from the Czech by R. and M. Weatherall. Blackwell. 16s.

Dr Hník has treated an important subject with due respect and thoroughness. He finely vindicates the old dictum of Gore that in the long run a community acts according to what it believes. First, the modern ideas of social charity and work are expounded. Then come chapters on the Gospels, Paul and the early Church. The rest of the book analyses the four great theological types: Thomist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Humanitarian. The author's own sympathy is with the humanitarian nature of his own Czecho-Slovakian Church, an interesting account of which ends the book. He sees in it a reaffirmation of the twofold commandment of love, obscured by the anti-humanist bias of Aquinas and Calvin alike. But he can magnanimously appreciate Thomist charity with its " refined moral starting-point and aim." For Calvin he holds the scales between Weber and Wünsch, but finally adds his weight to the former and his thesis of Calvinist capitalism. It is Luther who comes out lowest in the examination, for in rejecting the religious virtue of good deeds he encouraged people " to undertake charitable works in a state of self-satisfied sentimentality." For the Lutheran almsgiver had already justified his faith where the Catholic with more humble and consistent anxiety strove to lay up treasure in heaven. The Lutheran Church, unlike the Catholic or Calvinist, was so determined to avoid secularization that it allowed social service to become almost a secular monopoly. And so it remained helplessly looking on while the world was graced by a revival of Catholic charity in men like Borromeo and de Sales and the creative social energy of presbyters who in this as in other ways were old priests writ large.

Perhaps the strongest impression made by the book is the prevalence of other-worldliness; the reluctance of Christian thinkers to allow " the element of love towards one's neighbour *propter hominem* as a bond with complete religious validity accompanying a similar (but not identical) duty which one is to fulfil in one's love towards God." At the same time it is easy to under-estimate the philanthropic strength of this other-worldly motive in history, the detachment of Subiaco and the thorn bush preluding the monastic struggle against all the miseries of medieval anarchy. This leads to a more general criticism of method (or must it be methodology?). Surely it would be better to have some more general and concrete history to fill out these abstracted systems of thought. Can Christian philanthropy be sufficiently understood with so little or no mention of Constantine, the early Dark Ages, the Greek Orthodox tradition, the English Evangelicals and Christian Socialists? And in the

subjects chosen there is so little of the concrete. Luther's social thought, after all, was part of a drama which included many big parts, the Emperor, Frederick of Saxony, and the unhappy peasants. And Calvin's influence can hardly be understood without fuller mention of Geneva, that Reformation Moscow with its new-planned industries and magnetic attraction for young left-wingers. Christian sociologists can still afford to go to school with Marx. The abstract language forms part of the same objection. In sociology the variegated time-process ought to show its colours. Truth should be embodied in something of a tale. Further, in spite of this suppression of history, there is not a very clear sequence of thought or integration on the abstract plane. General statements often follow each other in a piecemeal succession. We need a broader working out of the valuable main lines of interpretation which are there all right but entangled among the massed items of secondary importance. This is, however, the vice of a virtue. There is, within the limits, a conscientious thoroughness in giving equal consideration to different sides of the subjects and different conclusions of research. Consequently it is a most useful body of material for the future study which is bound to come.

E. W. Edmonds.

Down the Jordan in a Canoe. By R. J. E. Boggis. S.P.C.K. 6s.

To do something that has never been done before is a distinction that can be claimed by few, and though Mr Boggis cannot make this claim he comes as near it as makes no difference. Four attempts had previously been made to navigate the Jordan. The first two (August, 1835, and August, 1847) failed tragically owing to the premature deaths from fever of their respective leaders; the third (April, 1848) succeeded in reaching the Dead Sea—an heroic achievement—but at the price of complete prostration of the entire party, preventing anything more than a partial exploration of its shores; the fourth (October, 1931), undertaken by one young man alone, who had previously prospected the valley from the air, met with signal success, though as far as to the entrance to the Dead Sea only. All these explorers were young or in the prime of life, but it was left to a man in his seventieth year, who is a biblical scholar, to carry their researches to completion. It is the record of this exciting cruise which forms the kernel of his book, to which, however, he modestly devotes but a single chapter. The earlier chapters are devoted to generous accounts of the enterprises of his predecessors, the latter ones to matters of scientific and historical interest.

With three well-chosen companions and a couple of specially

prepared canoes—" double-seater kayak folding canoes "—and a reasonable amount of equipment (but no tents), they crossed the Sea of Galilee from north to south on October 8, 1932. On the 17th they paddled out into the Dead Sea, not indeed without losses but without sickness or personal injury. Of the adventures of this interval—which included the negotiation of a hundred rapids, twenty-nine of which are reckoned serious—the narrative itself must tell. Success is attributed to several factors: good fortune, the choice of the best month, no rain, freedom from interference by natives, good health and good companions.

The existence of a great rift in the earth's crust, 4,000 miles in extent, of which the Jordan Valley forms a small but the deepest part, is a well enough known phenomenon; and though the author has naturally no new items of geological interest to contribute, he well and truly assembles the facts and their scientific explanation. Less known, probably, is the distribution of the fauna and flora of the valley, and to each of these he gives a local habitation and a name, while biblical references are interestingly related to the observations of naturalists. But for the student of the Bible the most interesting chapters will no doubt be those dealing with the geography and history of the valley, in which a fund of useful information is collected in a small space; while the whole subject is brought up to date by a summary statement of the facts that have led to present-day conditions in this region. Altogether a refreshing and instructive book from whatever angle it is regarded. It contains a few good photographs, but should a fresh impression be called for, as one may hope, the inclusion of a map would be a boon to the reader.

GEORGE SEAVER.

ART EXHIBITIONS

THE exhibitions this month are so many and so varied that it is difficult to find much rhyme or reason amongst them all. But art is supposed " to hold, as t'were, the mirror up to nature," and the nature of the modern world being in such chaos, it is not surprising that contemporary painting should be a little muddled too.

Perhaps the most interesting of the exhibitions for the purpose of the present review is that of L. S. Lowry at Alex. Reid and Lefèvre, Ltd. " Paintings of the Midlands," as it is entitled, suggests to the Londoner vistas of moorland and distant mountains, but oh no ! Here we have only factories and blocks of tenements, gasworks and barn-like churches, back-alleys, and, swarming amongst it all, hundreds of human beings. The painter's style is very reminiscent of that of Breughel; he takes a disinterested, bird's-eye view of the scene, and yet maintains

an intense sympathy with everything that is going on. Each person amongst the crowds is a separate individual about whom the artist has concerned himself, whether he be a man merely pleasantly standing at the street corner (*e.g.*, "A Removal," No. 18), or the personage "Laying a Foundation Stone" with a superb gesture (No. 15). Although there is no conscious preaching or moralizing in these paintings, such a work as "Family Group" (No. 24), with the useless-looking, bedraggled husband, the unhealthy M.D. girl, the lad with nothing but hate in his eyes, and the grim mother, who alone has character left in her face, is a terrible comment on modern social conditions. Mr Lowry, who works in Manchester, is not specifically Christian in his work, but he shows a general "emotional orthodoxy" in which the Industrial Christian Fellowship, for instance, would do well to be interested.

Amongst the other exhibitions, three of the finest living painters may be mentioned. The work of the Frenchwoman Marie Laurencin, which was shown at Rosenberg and Helft's last month, is representative of that ill-defined but essentially French movement epitomized in the music of Debussy. The gentleness and infinite delicacy of colour in the "Girl and the Powder-Puff" (No. 2), or the lyrical green of the "Pastoral" (No. 3), with its deer and nymph classically grouped together, make such loveliness as seems strange in this brutal Europe.

In contrast, the strong and vivid paintings by Matthew Smith at the Leicester Galleries are much more in keeping with perhaps a Wagnerian temperament. These pictures of girls and flowers swooning in deep luscious reds and chocolate-browns are real masterpieces; but, again, they are quite unrelated to contemporary life.

A third artist, Augustus John, some of whose pre-war work is being shown at the Redfern Gallery, is already acquiring something of the distinction of an "Old Master." His paintings of gipsy women and their children become in all their primitive splendour symbols of motherhood and boyhood (*e.g.*, No. 10). The apparent carelessness and facility of his brush-work, as in the sketch "The Panama Hat" (No. 60), has a sureness and subtlety almost comparable to that of Gainsborough.

Although, as was observed at the beginning of this review, these painters are so varied, yet they are all plainly prompted by the same motive, the love for things and human beings. This surely is the mainspring (but not He who can key it up) not only of the arts, but of all culture both Greek and Hebrew; and as St Paul suggests, without it all thinking and doing are useless, as "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal" indeed.

GILBERT N. WALTON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: C. F. Andrews, *The True India* (3s. 6d.); C. M. Duncan-Jones (ed.), *An Outline of Church History*, vol. 2 (4s. 6d.).

BERTELSMANN, GÜTERSLOH: P. Althaus, etc., *Adolf Schlatter und Wilhelm Lütgert zum Gedächtnis* (M.1.50); K. M. Hofmann, *Philema Hagion* (geb. M.7.50); R. Brezger, *Das Schrifttum von Professor D. A. Schlatter* (M.2.50); W. Oehler, *Das Wort des Johannes an die Gemeinde* (geb. M.6).

BRITISH MUSEUM: *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus* (1s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. D. Laborde (ed.), *Problems in Modern Education* (8s. 6d.).

CHURCH LITERATURE ASSOCIATION: H. G. Pigott, *Daily Meditations on the Lenten Epistles*; F. P. Harton, *The Faith that Abides* (1s. each).

T. AND T. CLARK: N. MacLeish, *The Nature of Religious Knowledge* (5s.).

DUCKWORTH: E. B. Redlich, *Form Criticism: Its Value and Limitations* (5s.).

L'EDITION UNIVERSELLE, BRUXELLES: G. Vromant, *De Matrimonio* (Belg. fr. 42).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei* (Hulsean Lectures) (10s. 6d.).

KEGAN PAUL: C. Guignebert, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus* (translated by S. H. Hooke) (21s.).

LONGMANS: P. Green, *Our Great High Priest* (3s. 6d.); P. McCormick, *Starting Afresh* (2s. 6d.); J. Mackinnon, *The Origins of the Reformation* (16s.); Elma K. Paget, *Henry Luke Paget* (8s. 6d.); E. B. Redlich, *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel* (5s.); Seven Missionaries, *Christians in Action: A Record of Work in War-time China* (2s. 6d.); Evelyn Underhill, *Eucharistic Prayers from the Ancient Liturgies* (2s. 6d.).

METHUEN: Z. N. Brooke, *A History of Europe* 911-1198 (16s.).

MOWBRAYS: Bede Frost, *Prayer for all Christians* (2s.); A. Karney, *Christ's Treasure House* (1s.); P. Loyd, *Doers of the Word* (4s. 6d.).

T. MURBY: G. C. Coulton, *The Bible and the Reformation*; J. C. Hardwick, *The Bible and Science*; R. B. Henderson, *The Battle of the Old Testament*; P. P. Levertoff, *The Messianic Hope*; C. Norwood, *The Poetry of the Bible* (6d. each).

NISBET: O. C. Quick, *Doctrines of the Creed* (10s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: L. Macneice, *Modern Poetry—a Personal Essay* (7s. 6d.); C. Williams, *The Passion of Christ: A Book for Meditation* (3s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS BOOK CLUB: L. Golding, *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver* (2s. 6d.); K. Ingram, *The Christian Challenge to Christians* (2s. 6d.); Eustace Percy, *John Knox* (2s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: L. I. Guiney, *Recusant Poets* (18s.).

SHELDON PRESS: S. M. Zwemer, *Studies in Popular Islam* (7s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. Burn-Murdoch, *Presbytery and Apostolic Succession* (1s.); P. Dearmer, *Man and His Maker* (cheap edition, 1s.); L. W. Grensted, *This Business of Living* (5s.); T. Kagawa, *Meditations on the Cross* (2s.).

S.P.C.K.: *Conferences between representatives of the Church of England and of the Churches of Latvia and Estonia* (2s.); R. G. Finch, *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament* (6s.); J. Foster, *The Church of the T'sang Dynasty* (4s.); O. Hardman, *Announcing the Psalms and Lessons* (6s.); *The New Testament Shortened* (2s. 6d. and 4s.).

CARL WINTER'S UNIVERSITÄTBUCHHANDLUNG (Heidelberg): W. Köhler, *Omnis ecclesia Petri propinqua* (M.2.70).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher